arXiv:1005.5386v1 [math.AP] 28 May 2010

Small coupling limit and multiple solutions to the Dirichlet Problem for Yang-Mills connections in 4 dimensions - Part II

Takeshi Isobe [*] and Antonella Marini [†]

Abstract

In this paper we complete the proof of the existence of multiple solutions (and, in particular, non minimal ones), to the ϵ-Dirichlet problem obtained as a variational problem for the $SU(2)_\epsilon$-Yang Mills functional. This is equivalent to proving the existence of multiple solutions to the Dirichlet problem for the $SU(2)$-Yang Mills functional with small boundary data. In the first paper of this series this non-compact variational problem is transformed into the finite dimensional problem of finding the critical points of the function $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$, which is essentially the Yang Mills functional evaluated on the approximate solutions, constructed via a gluing technique. In the present paper, we establish a Morse theory for $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$, by means of Ljusternik-Schnirelmann theory, thus complete the proofs of Theorems 1-3 in [4].

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$ be space of smooth connections with relative 2nd Chern number equal to 1, calculated with respect to a fixed absolute minimizer, say $\underline{A}_\epsilon$, with prescribed smooth boundary value A_0, of the $SU(2)_\epsilon$-Yang Mills functional

$$\mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A) = \int_{B^4} |F_A{}^\epsilon|^2 \, dx \,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $F_A{}^\epsilon = dA + \frac{1}{2}[A,A]_\epsilon := dA + \frac{\epsilon}{2}[A,A]$. The space $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$ is well-defined and non-empty, since an absolute minimum is known to exist always (cf. [6]), and by Taubes' gluing construction (cf. [10]).

The Euler Lagrange equations for (1.1) with prescribed smooth boundary value A_0 yield the ϵ-Dirichlet problem:

$$(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon) \qquad \begin{cases} d_A^{*}{}^\epsilon F_A{}^\epsilon = 0 & \text{in } B^4 \\ \iota^* A \sim A_0 & \text{at } \partial B^4 \,, \end{cases}$$

where, $\iota : \partial B^4 \to \overline{B}^4$ is the inclusion, the symbol $\sim$ stands for gauge equivalence, $d_A^{*}{}^\epsilon := *d * + \epsilon * [A, *\cdot]$, and $*$ denotes the Hodge star operator with respect to the flat metric on $\mathbb{R}^4$.

We recall that, for $\epsilon > 0$, solutions to $\big(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon\big)$ are in one-to-one correspondence with solutions to $\big(\mathcal{D}(\epsilon)\big)$, that is the Dirichlet problem for the standard $SU(2)$-Yang Mills functional with boundary value ϵA_0 (cf. § 2.2 in [4]).

In [3] it is shown that a solution to $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$, i.e. a *large* Yang Mills field with boundary value A_0, always exists in $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$, or $\mathcal{A}_{-1}(A_0)$ if A_0 is non-flat. With no loss of generality, we focus on

---

[*] Tokyo Institute of Technology; email: isobe.t.ab@m.titech.ac.jp

[†] University of L'Aquila / Yeshiva University; email: marini@dm.univaq.it

$\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$ (since all the results obtained can be transformed into results on $\mathcal{A}_{-1}(A_0)$, by simply reversing the orientation of B^4).

In the first paper of this series, the problem of finding solutions to the ϵ-Dirichlet problem $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ in $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$ is reduced, for small values of the parameter $\epsilon > 0$, to the finite dimensional problem of finding critical points of

$$\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) = \epsilon^2 \int_{B^4} |F_{A(\mathsf{q})+a(\mathsf{q})}{}^\epsilon|^2 \, dx \,, \qquad \text{for } \mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2, \epsilon) \,, \qquad \text{with } 0 < D_1 < D_2 \,, \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon) := \{\mathsf{q} := (p, [g], \lambda) \in \mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0) : D_1\epsilon < \lambda^2 < D_2\epsilon\} \,, \tag{1.3}$$

with

$$\mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0) := B^4_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (0, \lambda_0) \,, \qquad \text{for } 0 < 2\lambda_0 < d_0 \,, \tag{1.4}$$

is the parameter space used in the gluing procedure to construct the approximate solutions $A(\mathsf{q})$.

We recall that $A(\mathsf{q})$ is the approximate solution obtained by gluing the 1-instanton to $\underline{A}_\epsilon$, and $a(\mathsf{q})$ is the unique solution to the *auxiliary equation* defined in §3.6 of [4] (cf., in particular, Lemma 3.9 in [4]), and accounts for the interaction with the boundary (cf. [4] for the precise definitions). In Proposition 3.2 of [4] it is proved that the critical points of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the solutions to $\mathcal{D}_\epsilon$. In the present paper, we do the Morse theory for the finite dimensional functional $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$ on $\mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$ and complete the proof of the existence theorems of multiple solutions to $\mathcal{D}_\epsilon$ (Theorems 1-3 in §5 − §7).

More in detail, in §2 we study the asymptotic properties, as p approaches ∂B^4, of the function $F(p)$ and of the 3×3 matrix $M(A_0, p)$, which play a crucial role in our construction; in §3 we study the Morse theoretical properties of the function $R \to \mathsf{Tr}(RM)$, with $R \in SO(3)$, which translate into properties of the space of solutions to $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$, by taking $M = M(A_0, p)$; in §4 we prove two lemmas on the asymptotic behavior, as $\epsilon \to 0$, of the functional $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$, needed for the proofs of the main theorems, Theorems 1-3, proved in §5 − §7; in §8 we give a method to construct boundary data that yield any given matrix $M = M(A_0, p)$ (cf. next section), thus all the different cases enlisted in Theorem 3 can be obtained. Moreover, we show that the non-degeneracy assumption $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \mu_3 > 0$ on the eigenvalues μ_i $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ of $M(A_0, p)^t M(A_0, p)$ can always be achieved via a small perturbation of the boundary data.

We assume throughout this paper that λ_0, d_0, D_1, D_2, ϵ, q in (1.2)–(1.4) be fixed once and for all, with $0 < D_1 < D_2$, and $0 < 2\lambda_0 < d_0$.

2 Behavior of $F(p)$ and $M(A_0, p)$ near the boundary

The existence of multiple, and in particular non-minimal solutions to the ϵ-Dirichlet problem $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ for small positive values of the parameter ϵ, depends critically on the properties of the function $F(p)$ and of the 3×3 matrix $M(A_0, p)$, as expressed in the statements of Theorems 1-3 (cf. §5-§7).

We recall that

$$F(p)=\int_{B^4}|(dh_p)^-|^2\,dx\ ,\ p\in B^4\ , \tag{2.1}$$

and that, for a given boundary value A_0,

$$M(A_0,p):=\big(m_{ij}(A_0,p)\big)\ , \tag{2.2}$$

with

$$m_{ij}(A_0,p):=\int_{B^4}\big((d\underline{A}_{0,j})^-,(dh_{p,i})^-\big)\,dx\ ,\qquad (1\le i,j\le 3)\,,$$

where, for a given 2-form ω, we denote its anti-self dual component by ω^- (i.e., $\omega^-:=(\omega-*\omega)/2$), and $\underline{A}_0$ is a solution to the linear Dirichlet problem

$$(\mathcal{D}_0)\qquad \begin{cases} d^*dA=0 & \text{in } B^4\\ \iota^*A\sim A_0 & \text{on } \partial B^4\ ,\end{cases}$$

(Note that, by Hodge theory, $d\underline{A}_0$ is uniquely determined by the boundary value A_0, thus the definition above is well-posed).

In this section we study the asymptotic behavior of $F(p)$ and $M(A_0,p)$, as p approaches the boundary ∂B^4 of the four dimensional disk.

Lemma 2.1 *The function $F(p)=\int_{B^4}|(dh_p)^-|^2\,dx$, for $p\in B^4$ satisfies:*

(1) $F(p)>0$ for all $p\in B^4$;

(2) there exists a constant $C_1>0$ (independent of p) such that $F(p)=C_1d(p)^{-4}+o(d(p)^{-4})$ as $p\in B^4$ approaches ∂B^4, where $d(p):=1-|p|$ is the distance from p to ∂B^4;

(3) there exists a constant $C_2>0$ (independent of p) such that $F'(p)=C_2d(p)^{-5}\frac{p}{|p|}+o(d(p)^{-5})$ as $p\in B^4$ approaches ∂B^4.

Proof:

Proof of (1). Recall that h_p is defined as the solution of the Dirichlet problem $\Delta h_p=0$ in B^4 with boundary data $h_p(x)=\mathrm{Im}\frac{(\overline{x}-\overline{p})dx}{|x-p|^4}$ at ∂B^4 (where all the components, not only the tangential ones, are assigned at the boundary). For $1\le i\le 4$, let $\alpha_{p,i}=\alpha_{p,i}(x)$ be the solution of the Dirichlet problem $\Delta\alpha_{p,i}=0$ in B^4 and $\alpha_{p,i}(x)=\frac{x_i-p_i}{|x-p|^4}$ at ∂B^4. To prove (1), we rely on the Poisson integral representation of these functions.

By the Poisson's formula (see [11]), one has

$$\alpha_{p,i}(x)=\frac{1-|x|^2}{2\pi^2}\int_{S^3}\frac{1}{|x-y|^4}\frac{y_i-p_i}{|y-p|^4}\,dy \tag{2.3}$$

and, writing $h_p=h_{p,1}i+h_{p,2}j+h_{p,3}k$, these components satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}h_{p,1}&=-\alpha_{p,2}dx^1+\alpha_{p,1}dx^2+\alpha_{p,4}dx^3-\alpha_{p,3}dx^4,\\ h_{p,2}&=-\alpha_{p,3}dx^1-\alpha_{p,4}dx^2+\alpha_{p,1}dx^3+\alpha_{p,2}dx^4,\\ h_{p,3}&=-\alpha_{p,4}dx^1+\alpha_{p,3}dx^2-\alpha_{p,2}dx^3+\alpha_{p,1}dx^4.\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

By direct computation,

$$\begin{aligned}(dh_{p,1})^- = {} & \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^1}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^2}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^3}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^4}\Big)\omega_1^- \\ & +\frac{1}{2}\Big(-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^4}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^3}-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^2}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^1}\Big)\omega_2^- \\ & +\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^3}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^4}-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^1}-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^2}\Big)\omega_3^-\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(dh_{p,2})^- = {} & \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^4}-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^3}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^2}-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^1}\Big)\omega_1^- \\ & +\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^1}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^2}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^3}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^4}\Big)\omega_2^- \\ & +\frac{1}{2}\Big(-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^2}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^1}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^4}-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^3}\Big)\omega_3^-\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(dh_{p,3})^- = {} & \frac{1}{2}\Big(-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^3}-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^4}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^1}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^2}\Big)\omega_1^- \\ & +\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^2}-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^1}-\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^4}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^3}\Big)\omega_2^- \\ & +\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^1}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^2}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^3}+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^4}\Big)\omega_3^-\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where $\omega_1^- := dx^1\wedge dx^2 - dx^3\wedge dx^4$, $\omega_2^- := dx^1\wedge dx^3 + dx^2\wedge dx^4$ and $\omega_3^- := dx^1\wedge dx^4 - dx^2\wedge dx^3$ compose the standard basis for anti-self dual forms on $\mathbb{R}^4$.
By (2.3), we calculate

$$\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^1}(0)+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^2}(0)+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^3}(0)+\frac{\partial\alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^4}(0)=\frac{2}{\pi^2}\int_{S^3}\frac{1-y\cdot p}{|y-p|^6}\,dy>0 \tag{2.8}$$

for all $p\in B^4$, where "$\cdot$" represents the inner product in $\mathbb{R}^4$.

From (2.5)–(2.7), it follows that $|(dh_{p,i})^-(0)|>0$ for $1\le i\le 3$ and for all $p\in B^4$, thus $F(p)=\int_{B^4}|(dh_p)^-|^2\,dx>0$ for all $p\in B^4$.

Proof of (2). To prove (2), we write the functions $\alpha_{p,i}(x)$ explicitly in terms of the Green function for the Laplacian on B^4. More precisely, let $\Gamma(x,y)=\Gamma(|x-y|)=-\frac{1}{8\omega_4}|x-y|^{-2}$, where ω_4 is the volume of B^4, be the fundamental solution for the Laplacian in $\mathbb{R}^4$, and $G(x,y)$ the Green's function on B^4, with Dirichlet boundary data. Denote by $H(x,y)$ the regular part of $G(x,y)$, i.e., $H(x,y)=\Gamma(x,y)-G(x,y)$. The functions $\alpha_{p,i}$ are then given by

$$\alpha_{p,i}(x)=-4\omega_4\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}(x,p)\,,$$

and $H(x,p)$ is explicitly given by $H(x,p)=\Gamma(|p||x-p_*|)$ (c.f. [2]), where $p_*=p/|p|^2$ for $p\neq 0$, and $p_*=\infty$ for $p=0$. We thus have

$$\alpha_{p,i}(x)=-\frac{p_i}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^2}+\frac{x_i-p_{*,i}}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^4}-\frac{2p_ip\cdot(x-p_*)}{|p|^6|x-p_*|^4}\,,$$

and finally

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \alpha_{p,i}}{\partial x_j} = & \frac{2p_i(x_j - p_{*,j})}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^4} + \frac{\delta_{ij}}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^4} - \frac{4(x_i - p_{*,i})(x_j - p_{*,j})}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^6} \\ & - \frac{2p_ip_j}{|p|^6|x-p_*|^4} + \frac{8p_i(x_j - p_{*,j})p\cdot(x-p_*)}{|p|^6|x-p_*|^6}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Using (2.9), one calculates explicitly (2.5)–(2.7). In particular, the coefficient of ω_1^- in (2.5), namely $((dh_{p,1})^-, \omega_1^-)$, is

$$((dh_{p,1})^-, \omega_1^-) = \frac{2p\cdot(x-p_*)}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^4} - \frac{2}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^4} + \frac{8(p\cdot(x-p_*))^2}{|p|^6|x-p_*|^6}\,.$$

Similarly, the coefficients of ω_2^-, ω_3^- in (2.5), namely $((dh_{p,1})^-, \omega_2^-)$, $((dh_{p,1})^-, \omega_3^-)$, are

$$\begin{aligned}((dh_{p,1})^-, \omega_2^-) = & \left(\frac{2}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^4} + \frac{8p\cdot(x-p_*)}{|p|^6|x-p_*|^6}\right)(p_2(x_3 - p_{*,3}) - p_3(x_2 - p_{*,2})) \\ & + \left(\frac{2}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^4} + \frac{8p\cdot(x-p_*)}{|p|^6|x-p_*|^6}\right)(p_4(x_1 - p_{*,1}) - p_1(x_4 - p_{*,4}))\,,\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}((dh_{p,1})^-, \omega_3^-) = & \left(\frac{2}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^4} + \frac{8p\cdot(x-p_*)}{|p|^6|x-p_*|^6}\right)(p_2(x_4 - p_{*,4}) - p_4(x_2 - p_{*,2})) \\ & + \left(\frac{2}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^4} + \frac{8p\cdot(x-p_*)}{|p|^6|x-p_*|^6}\right)(p_1(x_3 - p_{*,3}) - p_3(x_1 - p_{*,1}))\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

In order to study the behavior of the integral $\int_{B^4} |(dh_p)^-|^2\,dx$ as $p \to \partial B^4$, it is sufficient to take $p = (0,0,0,-1+d)$ and let $d \to 0$. (The general case follows from this since approaching from tangential directions would contributes only lower order terms). By taking only the leading terms in the integrals below, one obtains the following asymptotic behaviors as $d \to 0$ (notice that $p_* = (0,0,0,-1-d) + O(d^2)$ as: $d \to 0$):

$$\begin{aligned}& \int_{B^4} ((dh_{p,1})^-, \omega_1^-)^2 \simeq \int_{B^4} \left(\frac{1}{|p|^4|x-p_*|^4} - \frac{4(p\cdot(x-p_*))^2}{|p|^6|x-p_*|^6}\right)^2 dx \\ \simeq & \int_{x_4 \geq -1} \left(\frac{1}{(x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2+(x_4+1+d)^2)^2} - \frac{4(x_4+1+d)^2}{(x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2+(x_4+1+d)^2)^3}\right)^2 dx \\ \simeq & \frac{1}{d^4}\int_{x_4 \geq 0} \left(\frac{1}{(x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2+(x_4+1)^2)^2} - \frac{4(x_1+1)^2}{(x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2+(x_4+1)^2)^3}\right)^2 dx \simeq \frac{1}{d^4}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}& \int_{B^4} ((dh_{p,1})^-, \omega_2^-)^2 \\ \simeq & \int_{B^4} \frac{(p\cdot(x-p_*))^2}{|p|^{12}|x-p_*|^{12}} (p_2(x_3-p_{*,3}) - p_3(x_2-p_{*,2}) + p_4(x_1-p_{*,1}) - p_1(x_4-p_{*,4}))^2\,dx \\ \simeq & \int_{x_4 \geq -1} \frac{(x_4+1+d)^2 x_1^2}{(x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2+(x_4+1+d)^2)^6}\,dx \simeq \frac{1}{d^4}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B^4}((dh_{p,1})^-,\omega_3^-)^2\,dx\\
&\simeq \int_{B^4}\frac{(p\cdot(x-p_*))^2}{|p|^{12}|x-p_*|^{12}}(p_2(x_4-p_{*,4})-p_4(x_2-p_{*,2})+p_1(x_3-p_{*,3})-p_3(x_1-p_{*,1}))^2\,dx\\
&\simeq \int_{x_4\geq -1}\frac{(x_4+1+d)^2x_2^2}{(x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2+(x_4+1+d)^2)^6}\,dx \simeq \frac{1}{d^4}\,. \qquad (2.14)
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining (2.12) – (2.14) yields

$$\int_{B^4}((dh_{p,j})^-)^2\,dx \simeq \frac{1}{d^4},\quad (d\to 0),\qquad \text{for } j=1,2,3\,, \tag{2.15}$$

thus $\int_{B^4}|(dh_p)^-|^2\,dx \simeq \frac{1}{d^4}$ as $d\to 0$.

Proof of (3).

The proof above just showed that there exists a positive constant C, independent of p, such that $\int_{B^4}|(dh_p)^-|^2\,dx = Cd(p_*,\partial B^4)^{-4}+o(d(p_*,\partial B^4)^{-4})$ as $d\to 0$. Formally, the assertion in (3) follows from differentiating this equation with respect to p. The detailed calculation, although more involved than the one performed to prove (2), is conceptually the same. So, we omit the details. □

Next, we estimate the limit behavior of $M(A_0,p)$ as p approaches ∂B^4:

Lemma 2.2 *Let $M(A_0,p):=(m_{ij}(A_0,p))$, for $p\in B^4$, be the matrix defined in the introduction, i.e., $m_{ij}(A_0,p)=\int_{B^4}\big((d\underline{A}_{0,j})^-,(dh_{p,i})^-\big)\,dx$. Then $m_{ij}(A_0,p)$ and its derivatives $\frac{\partial m_{ij}(A_0,p)}{\partial p_k}$ ($1\leq k\leq 4$) remain bounded as p approaches the boundary.*

Proof: The harmonicity of $d\underline{A}_{0,j}$ and Stokes theorem imply

$$m_{ij}(A_0,p) = -\int_{\partial B^4}\iota^*(d\underline{A}_{0,j})^-\wedge\iota^*(h_{p,i}) \tag{2.16}$$

where ι^* denotes the restriction to the boundary (the pull-back via the inclusion). For simplicity, we write $(d\underline{A}_{0,j})^- = \alpha_1\omega_1^- + \alpha_2\omega_2^- + \alpha_3\omega_3^-$ and, with no loss of generality, consider the case $i=1$. Writing $\iota^*h_{p,1} = \frac{1}{|x-p|^4}\big(-(x_2-p_2)dx_1+(x_1-p_1)dx_2-(x_3-p_3)dx_4+(x_4-p_4)dx_3\big)$ at ∂B^4, we have explicitly

$$
\begin{aligned}
m_{ij}(A_0,p) = &\int_{\partial B^4}\frac{1}{|x-p|^4}\big((\alpha_2(x)(x_1-p_1)-\alpha_3(x)(x_2-p_2)-\alpha_1(x)(x_4-p_4))dx_1\wedge dx_2\wedge dx_3\\
&+(\alpha_1(x)(x_3-p_3)+\alpha_2(x)(x_2-p_2)+\alpha_3(x)(x_1-p_1))dx_1\wedge dx_2\wedge dx_4\\
&+(-\alpha_1(x)(x_2-p_2)+\alpha_2(x)(x_3-p_3)+\alpha_3(x)(x_4-p_4))dx_1\wedge dx_3\wedge dx_4\\
&+(\alpha_1(x)(x_1-p_1)-\alpha_3(x)(x_3-p_3)+\alpha_2(x)(x_4-p_4))dx_2\wedge dx_3\wedge dx_4\big)\\
= &\int_{\partial B^4\cap|x-e|<\delta}\cdots+\int_{\partial B^4\cap|x-e|\geq\delta}\cdots\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.17}
$$

where $e=p/|p|$.

As for the proof of Lemma 2.1, it is sufficient to consider the case $p=(0,0,0,-1+d)$, and let $d\to 0$. Under this assumption, $e=(0,0,0,-1)$ and the second integral is bounded as $d \to 0$, for any fixed $\delta > 0$. For small positive δ, the first integral can be rewritten as an integral over $B^3_{\sqrt{\delta^2-d^2}}$, via the coordinate transformation $B^3_{\sqrt{\delta^2-d^2}} \ni x' := (x_1,x_2,x_3) \mapsto (x', -\sqrt{1-|x'|^2}) \in \partial B^4 \cap \{|x-e| < \delta\}$. Since $dx_4 = O(|x|)$, it is easy to see that all the integrals over $\partial B^4 \cap \{|x-e| < \delta\}$ in (2.17) remain bounded as $d \to 0$, with the possible exception of

$$\int_{\partial B^4 \cap |x-e|^2<\delta} \frac{1}{|x-p|^4}\big((\alpha_2(x)(x_1-p_1)-\alpha_3(x)(x_2-p_2)-\alpha_1(x)(x_4-p_4))dx_1\wedge dx_2\wedge dx_3\big) \quad (2.18)$$

To check that the latter also remains bounded as $d \to 0$, we write (using Taylor's expansion)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\partial B^4 \cap |x-e|^2<\delta} \frac{1}{|x-p|^4}\big((\alpha_2(x)(x_1-p_1)-\alpha_3(x)(x_2-p_2)-\alpha_1(x)(x_4-p_4))dx_1\wedge dx_2\wedge dx_3\big)\\
&= \int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{1}{(|x'|^2+d^2)}(\alpha_2(x', -\sqrt{1-|x'|^2})x_1 - \alpha_3(x', -\sqrt{1-|x'|^2})x_2\\
&\quad - \alpha_1(x', -\sqrt{1-|x'|^2})(-\sqrt{1-|x'|^2}+1-d)\, dx'\\
&= \int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{1}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^2}(\alpha_2(e)x_1 - \alpha_3(e)x_2 + d\alpha_1(e))\, dx'\\
&\quad + O\Big(\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{|x'|^2}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^2}\, dx'\Big) + O\Big(\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{d|x'|}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^2}\, dx'\Big)\\
&= d\alpha_1(e)\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{1}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^2}\, dx' + O\Big(\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{|x'|^2}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^2}\, dx'\Big)\\
&\quad + O\Big(\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{d|x'|}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^2}\, dx'\Big) = O(1) \qquad (d \to 0).
\end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

Thus, $m_{ij}(A_0, p)$ stays bounded as p approaches ∂B^4.

Next we differentiate (2.16) with respect to p_k, and obtain

$$\frac{\partial m_{ij}(A_0,p)}{\partial p_k} = -\int_{\partial B^4} \iota^*(F_{\underline{A}_0,j}{}^0)^- \wedge \iota^*\Big(\frac{\partial (h_{p,i})^-}{\partial p_k}\Big). \quad (2.20)$$

With no loss of generality, we take $k = 1$. Again, the only troublesome contribution (as $d \to 0$) in (2.20) could come from the integral over $\partial B^4 \cap \{|x-e| < \delta\}$ containing $dx_1 \wedge dx_2 \wedge dx_3$. The term of $-\frac{\partial}{\partial p_1}(F^-_{\underline{A}_0}, (dh_{p,1})^-)$ containing $dx_1 \wedge dx_2 \wedge dx_3$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial p_1}(|x-p|^{-4}(\alpha_2(x)(x_1-p_1)-\alpha_3(x)(x_2-p_2)-\alpha_1(x)(x_4-p_4))dx_1\wedge dx_2\wedge dx_3\\
&= 4|x-p|^{-6}(\alpha_2(x)(x_1-p_1)^2-\alpha_3(x)(x_1-p_1)(x_2-p_2)-\alpha_1(x)(x_1-p_1)(x_4-p_4))dx_1\wedge dx_2\wedge dx_3\\
&\quad - |x-p|^{-4}\alpha_2(x)dx_1\wedge dx_2\wedge dx_3\,,
\end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding integral over $\partial B^4 \cap \{|x-e| < \delta\}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{4}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^3}(\alpha_2(x',-\sqrt{1-|x'|^2})x_1^2 - \alpha_3(x',-\sqrt{1-|x'|^2})x_1x_2 \\
&\quad - \alpha_1(x',-\sqrt{1-|x'|^2})x_1(-\sqrt{1-|x'|^2}+1-d)\, dx_1 \wedge dx_2 \wedge dx_3 \\
&\quad - \int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{\alpha_2(x',-\sqrt{1-|x'|^2})}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^2}\, dx' \\
&= \int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{4\alpha_2(e)x_1^2}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^3}\, dx' - \int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{4\alpha_3(e)x_1x_2}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^3}\, dx' + \int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{d\alpha_1(e)x_1}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^3}\, dx' \\
&\quad - \int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{\alpha_2(e)}{(|x|^2+d^2)^2}\, dx' + O\Big(\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{|x'|^4}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^3}\, dx'\Big) \\
&\quad + O\Big(\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{d|x'|^2}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^3}\, dx'\Big) + O\Big(\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{|x'|^2}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^2}\, dx'\Big) \\
&= \int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{4\alpha_2(e)x_1^2}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^3}\, dx' - \int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{\alpha_2(e)}{(|x|^2+d^2)^2}\, dx' + O(d|\log d|) + O(1) \qquad (2.21)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{4x_1^2}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^3}\, dx' = \frac{1}{d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{4x_1^2}{(|x'|^2+1)^3} + O(1)\,,$$

$$\int_{|x'|^2<\delta^2-d^2} \frac{1}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^2}\, dx' = \frac{1}{d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{(|x'|^2+1)^2}\, dx' + O(1)\,,$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{4x_1^2}{(|x'|^2+1)^3}\, dx' = \frac{4}{3}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{|x'|^2}{(|x'|^2+d^2)^3}\, dx' = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{(|x'|^2+1)^2}\, dx'\,.$$

Thus, also the contribution of (2.21) remains bounded as $d \to 0$. This completes the proof. $\Box$

3 Critical points for the function τ_M

Let M be a given 3×3 real matrix. For $R \in SO(3)$, we define the function $\tau_M(R) = \mathsf{Tr}(RM)$. In this section, we study the Morse theoretical properties of this function. These results will be applied (cf. Sections §5 – §8) to the matrix $M(A_0, p_0)$ (cf. (2.2)), for a fixed given boundary value A_0 and a fixed given point p_0, and are a crucial ingredient in the proofs of Theorems 1–3 (cf., in particular (5.6)). The next two lemmas serve to characterize the set of critical points of τ_M.

Lemma 3.1 *$R = R_0 \in SO(3)$ is a critical point for τ_M if and only if R_0M is symmetric.*

Proof: $R = R_0 \in SO(3)$ is a critical point if and only if $d\tau_M(R_0)(\xi) = \frac{d}{dt}\tau_M(\exp(t\xi)R_0)|_{t=0} = \mathsf{Tr}(\xi R_0 M) = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$. Set $B := R_0M$ and denote by B_+ and B_- the symmetric, and anti-symmetric parts of B, respectively, i.e., $B_+ = (B + B^t)/2$ and $B_- = (B - B^t)/2$. Since $\mathsf{Tr}(\xi B_+) = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$, $d\tau_M(R_0) = 0$ is equivalent to $\mathsf{Tr}(\xi B_-) = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$. Taking $\xi = B_-$, this implies $B_- = 0$. Therefore, R_0 is critical if and only if $B_- = 0$, i.e., $B = R_0M$ is symmetric. $\Box$

Lemma 3.2 *Assume* $\det M \neq 0$*. There exists a one to one correspondence between the set of critical points of* τ_M *in* $SO(3)$ *and the set of symmetric* 3×3*-matrix* B *with* $\det B = \det M$ *and* $B^2 = M^t M$*.*

Proof: Suppose $R = R_0 \in SO(3)$ is a critical point for τ_M. Set $B = R_0 M$. By Lemma 3.1, B is symmetric. Moreover, since $R_0 \in SO(3)$, one has $\det B = \det M$ and $B^2 = B^t B = M^t R_0^t R_0 M = M^t M$.

Conversely, suppose B is a symmetric matrix with $\det B = \det M$ and $B^2 = M^t M$. Define $R_0 := BM^{-1}$. Then $\det R_0 = 1$ and $R_0^t R_0 = 1$, i.e., $R_0 \in SO(3)$. Since $R_0 M = B$ is symmetric, R_0 is a critical point for τ_M by Lemma 3.1. This completes the proof. $\square$

In the following we assume $\det M \neq 0$. See Remark 3.1 at the end of this section for the case $\det M = 0$. By Lemma 3.2, the problem of finding critical points of τ_M is transformed into the problem of finding symmetric matrices B with $\det B = \det M$ and $B^2 = M^t M$. The latter is easily solved as follows:

A symmetric matrix B is diagonalizable by an orthogonal matrix. So, there exists $P \in O(3)$ such that $P^{-1}BP = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$, where the λ_i's ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) are the eigenvalues of B with $|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq |\lambda_3|$. We may assume $P \in SO(3)$ (otherwise, we take $-P$).

Denote by $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \mu_3 > 0$ the eigenvalues of $M^t M$ ($M^t M$ is symmetric and positive). The condition $B^2 = M^t M$ entails $P \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3^2 \end{pmatrix} P^{-1} = M^t M$, thus $\lambda_i^2 = \mu_i$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, or, equivalently, $\lambda_i = \pm\sqrt{\mu_i}$. Since $\det B = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3$, and $\det M = \pm\sqrt{\mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3}$, the condition $\det M = \det B$ yields the possibilities for the matrix B enlisted in the following lemma. Notice that, in all the different cases, the critical value corresponding to the critical point

$$R_0 := BM^{-1} = P \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix} P^{-1} M^{-1}$$

is given by $\mathsf{Tr}\, B = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$.

Lemma 3.3 *Let* M *be a given* 3×3 *real matrix, such that* $M^t M$ *has eigenvalues* $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \mu_3 > 0$*, and let* B *a symmetric* 3×3 *real matrix, with* $\det B = \det M$ *and* $B^2 = M^t M$*. Then, there exists* $P \in SO(3)$ *such that* $B = P \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix} P^{-1}$*, where the possible* λ_i*'s are enlisted below:*

(1) If $\det M := +\sqrt{\mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3} > 0$*. In this case* $\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3 > 0$*, and there are four possibilities:*

- *(a)* $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{\mu_1}$, $\lambda_2 = \sqrt{\mu_2}$, $\lambda_3 = \sqrt{\mu_3}$, *yielding the critical value* $\sqrt{\mu_1} + \sqrt{\mu_2} + \sqrt{\mu_3}$,
- *(b)* $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{\mu_1}$, $\lambda_2 = -\sqrt{\mu_2}$, $\lambda_3 = -\sqrt{\mu_3}$, *yielding the critical value* $\sqrt{\mu_1} - \sqrt{\mu_2} - \sqrt{\mu_3}$,
- *(c)* $\lambda_1 = -\sqrt{\mu_1}$, $\lambda_2 = \sqrt{\mu_2}$, $\lambda_3 = -\sqrt{\mu_3}$, *yielding the critical value* $-\sqrt{\mu_1} + \sqrt{\mu_2} - \sqrt{\mu_3}$,

   - *(d)* $\lambda_1 = -\sqrt{\mu_1}$, $\lambda_2 = -\sqrt{\mu_2}$, $\lambda_3 = \sqrt{\mu_3}$, *yielding the critical value* $-\sqrt{\mu_1} - \sqrt{\mu_2} + \sqrt{\mu_3}$.

- *(2) If* $\det M := -\sqrt{\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3} < 0$. *In this case* $\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 < 0$, *and there also are four possibilities:*
   - *(a)* $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{\mu_1}$, $\lambda_2 = \sqrt{\mu_2}$, $\lambda_3 = -\sqrt{\mu_3}$, *yielding the critical value* $\sqrt{\mu_1} + \sqrt{\mu_2} - \sqrt{\mu_3}$,
   - *(b)* $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{\mu_1}$, $\lambda_2 = -\sqrt{\mu_2}$, $\lambda_3 = \sqrt{\mu_3}$, *yielding the critical value* $\sqrt{\mu_1} - \sqrt{\mu_2} + \sqrt{\mu_3}$,
   - *(c)* $\lambda_1 = -\sqrt{\mu_1}$, $\lambda_2 = \sqrt{\mu_2}$, $\lambda_3 = \sqrt{\mu_3}$, *yielding the critical value* $-\sqrt{\mu_1} + \sqrt{\mu_2} + \sqrt{\mu_3}$,
   - *(d)* $\lambda_1 = -\sqrt{\mu_1}$, $\lambda_2 = -\sqrt{\mu_2}$, $\lambda_3 = -\sqrt{\mu_3}$, *yielding the critical value* $-\sqrt{\mu_1} - \sqrt{\mu_2} - \sqrt{\mu_3}$.

(Note that the list above gives all the possible critical values for τ_M, if $\det M \neq 0$.)

We next study the non-degeneracy of all the critical points and calculate their Morse indexes, still in the hypothesis $\det M \neq 0$.

To this purpose, we study the Hessian of τ_M at $R_0 := BM^{-1}$. This is given by

$$\nabla^2\tau_M(R_0)(\xi,\zeta) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial s\partial t}\tau_M(\exp(s\xi + t\zeta)R_0M)\big|_{s=t=0} = \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{Tr}((\xi\zeta + \zeta\xi)R_0M) = \mathsf{Tr}(\xi\zeta B)$$

for $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$, where in the last equality we have used the fact that R_0M is symmetric.

Let $P \in SO(3)$ be as before. We represent $\nabla^2\tau_M(R_0)$ with respect to the basis $P\xi_iP^{-1}$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, with $\xi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\xi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\xi_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

An easy calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2\tau_M(R_0)(P\xi_iP^{-1}, P\xi_jP^{-1}) &= \mathsf{Tr}(\xi_i\xi_jP^{-1}BP) = 0, \qquad 1 \leq i \neq j \leq 3\ , \\ \nabla^2\tau_M(R_0)(P\xi_1P^{-1}, P\xi_1P^{-1}) &= \mathsf{Tr}(\xi_1^2P^{-1}BP) = -\lambda_2 - \lambda_3\ , \\ \nabla^2\tau_M(R_0)(P\xi_2P^{-1}, P\xi_2P^{-1}) &= \mathsf{Tr}(\xi_2^2P^{-1}BP) = -\lambda_1 - \lambda_3\ , \\ \nabla^2\tau(R_0)(P\xi_3P^{-1}, P\xi_3P^{-1}) &= \mathsf{Tr}(\xi_3^2P^{-1}BP) = -\lambda_1 - \lambda_2\ . \end{aligned}$$

So, the Hessian $\nabla^2\tau_M(R_0)$ is written as $\begin{pmatrix} -\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_1 - \lambda_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}$.

From this, the Morse indexes of the critical points corresponding to all the possible cases, which we described in Lemma 3.3, are easily computed as stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4 *Let* M, B, τ_M *be given as in the previous lemmas.*

- *(1) If* $\det M := +\sqrt{\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3} > 0$. *In the four different cases, (1)-(a), (b), (c), (d) of Lemma 3.3, the following assertions hold, respectively:*
   - *(a) all the* λ_j*'s are strictly positive, the Hessian is negative-definite, the critical points are non-degenerate with Morse index equal to* 3,
   - *(b)* $-\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = -\sqrt{\mu_1} + \sqrt{\mu_2} \leq 0$, $-\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 = \sqrt{\mu_2} + \sqrt{\mu_3} > 0$, $-\lambda_1 - \lambda_3 = -\sqrt{\mu_1} + \sqrt{\mu_3} \leq 0$, *thus the critical points are non-degenerate if and only if* $\mu_1 > \mu_2$, *in which case, they have Morse index equal to* 2,

(c) $-\lambda_1-\lambda_2=\sqrt{\mu_1}-\sqrt{\mu_2}\geq 0$, $-\lambda_2-\lambda_3=-\sqrt{\mu_2}+\sqrt{\mu_3}\leq 0$, $-\lambda_1-\lambda_3=\sqrt{\mu_1}+\sqrt{\mu_3}>0$, *thus the critical points are non-degenerate if and only if* $\mu_1>\mu_2>\mu_3$, *in which case, they have Morse index equal to* 1,

(d) $-\lambda_1-\lambda_2=\sqrt{\mu_1}+\sqrt{\mu_2}>0$, $-\lambda_2-\lambda_3=\sqrt{\mu_2}-\sqrt{\mu_3}\geq 0$, $-\lambda_1-\lambda_3=\sqrt{\mu_1}-\sqrt{\mu_3}\geq 0$, *thus the critical points are non-degenerate if and only if* $\mu_2>\mu_3$, *in which case, they have Morse index equal to* 0*;*

(2) if $\det M:=-\sqrt{\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3}<0$*. In the four different cases (2)-(a), (b), (c), (d) of Lemma 3.3, the following assertions hold, respectively:*

(a) $-\lambda_1-\lambda_2=-\sqrt{\mu_1}-\sqrt{\mu_2}<0$, $-\lambda_2-\lambda_3=-\sqrt{\mu_2}+\sqrt{\mu_3}\leq 0$, $-\lambda_1-\lambda_3=-\sqrt{\mu_1}+\sqrt{\mu_3}\leq 0$, *thus the critical points are non-degenerate if and only if* $\mu_2>\mu_3$, *in which case, they have Morse index equal to* 3,

(b) $-\lambda_1-\lambda_2=-\sqrt{\mu_1}+\sqrt{\mu_2}\leq 0$, $-\lambda_2-\lambda_3=\sqrt{\mu_2}-\sqrt{\mu_3}\geq 0$, $-\lambda_1-\lambda_3=-\sqrt{\mu_1}-\sqrt{\mu_3}<0$, *thus the critical points are non-degenerate if and only if* $\mu_1>\mu_2>\mu_3$, *in which case, they have Morse index equal to* 2,

(c) $-\lambda_1-\lambda_2=\sqrt{\mu_1}-\sqrt{\mu_2}\geq 0$, $-\lambda_2-\lambda_3=-\sqrt{\mu_2}-\sqrt{\mu_3}<0$, $-\lambda_1-\lambda_3=\sqrt{\mu_1}-\sqrt{\mu_3}\geq 0$, *thus the critical points are non-degenerate if and only if* $\mu_1>\mu_2$, *in which case, they have Morse index equal to* 1,

(d) all λ_i*'s are strictly negative, and the Hessian is positive-definite, thus the corresponding critical points are non-degenerate, with Morse index equal to* 0.

We finally prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5 *For all the non-degenerate cases (described in Lemma 3.4), there corresponds exactly one critical point for each critical value.*

Proof: Note that in the non-degenerate cases $\lambda_i+\lambda_j\neq 0$, $\forall i,j$. We must show that for a given critical value (as listed in Lemma 3.3), there exists exactly one B satisfying $\det B=\det M$ and $B^2=M^tM$. So suppose both of B and B' satisfy these two conditions. Then, there exist $P,Q\in SO(3)$ such that $P^{-1}BP=D$ and $Q^{-1}B'Q=D'$, where $D=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda_1&0&0\\0&\lambda_2&0\\0&0&\lambda_3\end{pmatrix}$ and $D'=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda'_1&0&0\\0&\lambda'_2&0\\0&0&\lambda'_3\end{pmatrix}$ are diagonal matrices with $|\lambda_1|\geq|\lambda_2|\geq|\lambda_3|$, and $|\lambda'_1|\geq|\lambda'_2|\geq|\lambda'_3|$. By Lemma 3.3, $D=D'$. The condition $B^2=B'^2=M^tM$ implies $PD^2P^{-1}=QD'^2Q^{-1}=QD^2Q^{-1}$, thus $CD^2C^{-1}=D^2$, with $C:=Q^{-1}P\in SO(3)$. Denoting by c_{ij} the entries of C, we thus obtain

$$(\lambda_i^2-\lambda_j^2)c_{ij}=0\,,\quad 1\leq i,j\leq 3\,.$$

Since $\lambda_i+\lambda_j\neq 0$, for all i,j, in all the non-degenerate cases, this yields

$$(\lambda_i-\lambda_j)c_{ij}=0\,,\quad 1\leq i,j\leq 3\,.$$

But this last condition is equivalent to $CDC^{-1} = D$, thus $B = B'$, and the lemma is proved. □

Remark 3.1 *If* $\det M = 0$*, similar arguments show that the possible critical values for* τ_M *are: (a)* $\sqrt{\mu_1} + \sqrt{\mu_2}$*, (b)* $\sqrt{\mu_1} - \sqrt{\mu_2}$*, (c)* $-\sqrt{\mu_1} + \sqrt{\mu_2}$*, and (d)* $-\sqrt{\mu_1} - \sqrt{\mu_2}$*. Moreover, for each critical value there corresponds exactly one critical point in the cases (a), (d), and, also, in the cases (b),(c), provided that* $\sqrt{\mu_1} \neq \sqrt{\mu_2}$*. The corresponding critical point is non-degenerate if and only if* $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 > 0$ *in the cases (a),(d), and if and only if* $\mu_1 > \mu_2 > 0$ *in the cases (b),(c). The corresponding Morse indexes are* 3 *in the case (a),* 2 *in the case (b),* 1 *in the case (c),* 0 *in the case (d). Thus,* τ_M *is a Morse function exactly when* $\mu_1 > \mu_2 > 0$*. In this case (and this is the only one we need in this paper), the above four values are in fact critical values for* τ_M*. Indeed, by the Ljusternik-Schnirelmann theory (see [9] and the proof of Theorem 3), any function on* $SO(3)$ *has at least four critical points, since the Ljusternik-Schnirelmann category of* $SO(3) \cong \mathbb{R}P^3$ *is* 4 *(see [9]).*

4 Asymptotic estimates of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$ and $\mathcal{J}'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$

In order to prove Theorems 1–3, we need the following lemmas which compare asymptotically, as $\epsilon \to 0$, the functional $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) = \epsilon^2 \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q}) + a(\mathsf{q}))$ with the functional $J_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) = \epsilon^2 \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q}))$, both defined on the parameter space $\mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$ (cf. (1.2)-(1.4)). Since an estimate of $J_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$ and of its derivative $J'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$ are given in §3.2 of [4], these lemmas yield estimates for $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$ and its derivative $\mathcal{J}'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$.

We recall that for connections A on the bundle P and one-forms $a \in C^\infty(T^*\overline{B}^4 \otimes \mathrm{Ad}(P))$, the L^2_1-norm $\|a\|_{A;1,2}$ is defined by

$$\|a\|_{A;1,2} := \|\nabla_A{}^{\epsilon} a\|_2 + \|a\|_2 \ , \tag{4.1}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the L^2-norm on B^4. Observe that the space $L^2_{0,1}(T^*B^4 \otimes \mathrm{Ad}(P))$ (the completion of $C^\infty_0(T^*B^4 \otimes \mathrm{Ad}(P))$ with respect to the norm above) is independent of the choice of the connection A. We also recall that the *dual* L^2_1-norm of $\nabla\mathcal{YM}_\epsilon$ is defined by

$$\|\nabla\mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A)\|_{A;1,2,*} := \sup\{\nabla\mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A)(a) : a \in L^2_{0,1}(T^*B^4 \otimes \mathrm{Ad}(P)),\ \|a\|_{A;1,2} \leq 1\} \ . \tag{4.2}$$

Lemma 4.1 *For* $\mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$*, there holds*

$$\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) = J_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) + r_3(\mathsf{q}), \tag{4.3}$$

where $|r_3(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^3$ *uniformly with respect to* q.

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) &= \epsilon^2 \int_{B^4} |F_{A(\mathsf{q})+a(\mathsf{q})}{}^{\epsilon}|^2 \, dx \\
&= \epsilon^2 \int_{B^4} |F_{A(\mathsf{q})}{}^{\epsilon}|^2 \, dx + \epsilon^2 \int_{B^4} |d_{A(\mathsf{q})}{}^{\epsilon} a(\mathsf{q})|^2 \, dx + \frac{\epsilon^4}{4} \int_{B^4} |[a(\mathsf{q}), a(\mathsf{q})]|^2 \, dx \\
+2\epsilon^2 &\int_{B^4} (F_{A(\mathsf{q})}{}^{\epsilon}, d_{A(\mathsf{q})}{}^{\epsilon} a(\mathsf{q})) \, dx + \epsilon^3 \int_{B^4} (F_{A(\mathsf{q})}{}^{\epsilon}, [a(\mathsf{q}), a(\mathsf{q})]) \, dx + \epsilon^3 \int_{B^4} (d_{A(\mathsf{q})}{}^{\epsilon} a(\mathsf{q}), [a(\mathsf{q}), a(\mathsf{q})]) \, dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

The first term on the right hand side of (4.4) is $J_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$. The remaining terms are easily estimated by Lemmas 3.2 and 3.9 in [4], and the Sobolev inequality: the second, third, fifth and sixth terms are bounded by $C\epsilon^3$ for some $C > 0$ depending only on d_0, λ_0, D_1 and D_2. The fourth term is estimated as

$$\epsilon^2 \left| \int_{B^4} ({F_{A(\mathsf{q})}}^\epsilon, {d_{A(\mathsf{q})}}^\epsilon a(\mathsf{q}))\, dx \right| \leq \epsilon^2 \|\nabla \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q}))\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2,*} \|a(\mathsf{q})\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4} \lesssim \epsilon^3.$$

Combining all these estimates, (4.3) follows easily. □

The following lemma compares the derivative of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$ with the derivative of $J_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$. We use the following notation: $\mathsf{q}_i(\mathsf{q})$ for $i = 1, ..., 8$ are the vector fields constructed in [5] such that $a_i(\mathsf{q}) = A_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})$ (the directional derivative of $A(\mathsf{q})$ in the direction of $\mathsf{q}_i(\mathsf{q})$).

Lemma 4.2 *The following holds:*

$$\langle \mathcal{J}'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}), \mathsf{q}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle = \langle J'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}), \mathsf{q}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle + r_{4,i}(\mathsf{q}),$$

where $|r_{4,i}(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^4$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq 4$ *and* $|r_{4,i}(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^{7/2}$ *for* $5 \leq i \leq 8$ *uniformly with respect to* $\mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$.

Proof: One has

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{J}'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}), \mathsf{q}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle &= \epsilon^2 \langle \nabla \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q}) + a(\mathsf{q})), \mathsf{a}_i(\mathsf{q}) + a_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})\rangle \\
&= \epsilon^2 \langle \nabla \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q})), \mathsf{a}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle + \epsilon^2 \langle \nabla \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q})), a_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})\rangle \\
&\quad + \epsilon^2 \langle \nabla^2 \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q})) a(\mathsf{q}), \mathsf{a}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle + \epsilon^2 \langle \nabla^2 \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q})) a(\mathsf{q}), a_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})\rangle \\
&\quad + \epsilon^2 \langle R(\mathsf{q}; a(\mathsf{q})), \mathsf{a}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle + \epsilon^2 \langle R(\mathsf{q}; a(\mathsf{q})), a_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})\rangle. \qquad (4.5)
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate each terms in (4.5). The first term is $\langle J'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}), \mathsf{q}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle$. By Lemmas 3.2 and 3.10 in [4], the second term is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
|\epsilon^2 \langle \nabla \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q})), a_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})\rangle| &\leq \epsilon^2 \|\nabla \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q}))\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2,*} \|a_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4} \\
&\lesssim \epsilon^4 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq 4; \quad \text{or} \quad \lesssim \epsilon^{7/2} \quad \text{for } 5 \leq i \leq 8. \qquad (4.6)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas 3.2, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9 in [4], the third term is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\epsilon^2 \langle \nabla^2 \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q})) a(\mathsf{q}), \mathsf{a}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle| \leq \epsilon^2 \|\nabla^2 \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q})) \mathsf{a}_i(\mathsf{q})\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2,*} \|a(\mathsf{q})\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4} \\
&\lesssim \epsilon^{5/2} \|(\nabla^2 \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q})) - \nabla^2 \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(\tilde{A}(\mathsf{q}))) \mathsf{a}_i(\mathsf{q})\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2,*} + \epsilon^{5/2} \|\nabla^2 \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(\tilde{A}(\mathsf{q}))(\mathsf{a}_i(\mathsf{q}) - \tilde{\mathsf{a}}_i(\mathsf{q}))\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2,*} \\
&\lesssim \epsilon^4 + \epsilon^{5/2} \|\mathsf{a}_i(\mathsf{q}) - \tilde{\mathsf{a}}_i(\mathsf{q})\|_{A)(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4} \lesssim \epsilon^4 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq 4\,; \quad \text{or} \ \lesssim \epsilon^{7/2} \quad \text{for } 5 \leq i \leq 8\,. \quad (4.7)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas 3.2, 3.9 and 3.10 in [4], the fourth term is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\epsilon^2 \langle \nabla^2 \mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A(\mathsf{q})) a(\mathsf{q}), a_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})\rangle| \leq \epsilon^2 \|a(\mathsf{q})\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4} \|a_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4} \\
&\lesssim \epsilon^4 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq 4\,; \quad \text{or} \ \lesssim \epsilon^{7/2} \quad \text{for } 5 \leq i \leq 8\,, \qquad (4.8)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by Lemmas 3.2, 3.3, 3.9 in [4], the fifth term is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}|\epsilon^2\langle R(\mathsf{q};a(\mathsf{q})),\mathsf{a}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle| &\lesssim \epsilon^2(\epsilon\|a(\mathsf{q})\|^2_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4}+\epsilon^2\|a(\mathsf{q})\|^3_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4})\\ &\lesssim \epsilon^4 \quad \text{for } 1\le i\le 8\,,\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

and, by Lemmas 3.2, 3.3, 3.9, 3.10 in [4], the last term is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}|\epsilon^2\langle R(\mathsf{q};a(\mathsf{q})),a_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})\rangle| &\lesssim \epsilon^2(\epsilon\|a(\mathsf{q})\|^2_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4}+\epsilon^2\|a(\mathsf{q})\|^3_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4})\|a_{\mathsf{q}_i}(\mathsf{q})\|_{A(\mathsf{q});1,2;B^4}\\ &\lesssim \epsilon^5 \quad \text{for } 1\le i\le 8\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

The Lemma follows from (4.5)–(4.10). □

By Proposition 3.1 in [4] and Lemma 3.2 in [5], the leading term $\langle J'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}),\mathsf{q}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle$ of equation (4.3) is estimated as

$$\langle J'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}),\mathsf{q}_1(\mathsf{q})\rangle = a_{11}(\mathsf{q})\Big\langle J'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}),\frac{\partial}{\partial p_1}\Big\rangle \simeq \epsilon^{7/2}C_1(\mathsf{q})\,,$$

where $C_1(\mathsf{q})$ is a constant depending only on q.
Similarly, it follows that:

$$\langle J'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}),\mathsf{q}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle \simeq \epsilon^{7/2}C_i(\mathsf{q}) \quad \text{for} \quad 1\le i\le 4,$$

and

$$\langle J'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}),\mathsf{q}_i(\mathsf{q})\rangle \simeq \epsilon^{3}C_i(\mathsf{q}) \quad \text{for} \quad 5\le i\le 8,$$

with $C_i(\mathsf{q})$ depending only on q.

5 Proof of Theorem 1

We are now ready to prove the first of our existence theorems stated in [4], which we state again here for the convenience of the reader. We recall that Theorems 1-3 can all be restated in terms of the Dirichlet problem for the $SU(2)$-Yang Mills functional with boundary value ϵA_0 (cf. §1 of this paper or §2.2 of [4]).

Theorem 1 *Let us define the function* $G_1^{\pm}(p) := \frac{(\sqrt{\mu_1(p)}+\sqrt{\mu_2(p)}\pm\sqrt{\mu_3(p)})^2}{F(p)}$, $p\in B^4$, *and assume that* $p_0\in B^4$ *satisfies either of the following hypotheses (1),(2):*

(1) $\det M(A_0,p_0)>0$ *and* p_0 *is an isolated local maximum point of* $G_1^+(p)$;

(2) $\det M(A_0,p_0)<0$ *and* p_0 *is an isolated local maximum point of* $G_1^-(p)$.

Then, there exists $\epsilon_0>0$ *and a family of connections* $\{A_\epsilon\}$ *indexed by* $\epsilon\in(0,\epsilon_0]$ *with the following properties:* A_ϵ *is a solution to* $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ *in* $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$; $\epsilon^2|F_{A_\epsilon}{}^\epsilon|^2\,dx\to 8\pi^2\delta_{p_0}$ *as* $\epsilon\to 0$ *in the sense of measures (i.e.* $\epsilon F_{A_\epsilon}{}^\epsilon$ *concentrates at* p_0 *as* $\epsilon\to0$*).*

Proof: Case (1). We assume that $p_0 \in B^4$ is such that $\det M(A_0, p_0) > 0$, and is an isolated local maximum point for the function G_1^+. Thus, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $B_\delta(p_0) \Subset B^4$, $\det M(A_0, p) > 0$ for all $p \in B_\delta(p_0)$, and $G_1^+(p_0) > G_1(p)^+$ for all $p \in B_\delta(p_0) \setminus \{p_0\}$. From now on, we fix such δ and restrict our choice of $0 < D_1 < D_2$ as follows:

$$0 < D_1 < \frac{1}{2}\frac{\Gamma_1^+(p_0)}{F(p_0)}, \tag{5.1}$$

$$D_1^2 F(p) - 2D_1\Gamma_1^+(p) \geq -\frac{1}{2}G_1^+(p_0), \tag{5.2}$$

$$2\frac{\Gamma_1^+(p_0)}{F(p_0)} < D_2, \tag{5.3}$$

$$D_2^2 F(p) - 2D_2\Gamma_1^+(p) \geq -\frac{1}{2}G_1^+(p_0), \tag{5.4}$$

for all $p \in B_\delta(p_0)$, where $\Gamma_1^+(p) := \sqrt{\mu_1(A_0, p)} + \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0, p)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0, p)}$. Note that (5.1), (5.2) are both satisfied if $D_1 > 0$ is chosen suitably small, while (5.3), (5.4) are both satisfied if D_2 is chosen suitably large, since $F(p) > 0$ in B^4 (cf. (1) of Lemma 2.1).

We then choose $d_0 > 0$ such that $B_\delta(p_0) \Subset B_{1-d_0}(0)$. Under the assumptions above on D_1, D_2, d_0, we define $\mathcal{P}(p_0, \delta; d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$, a subset of $\mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$, as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}(p_0, \delta; d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon) = \{(p, [g], \lambda) \in \mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon) : p \in B_\delta(p_0)\}.$$

Since q is a critical point for $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$ if and only if $A(\mathsf{q}) + a(\mathsf{q})$ is a Yang Mills connection (cf. Proposition 3.2 in [4]), we look for critical points of the function $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$ in the interior of $\mathcal{P}(p_0, \delta; d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$. Since the closure of $\mathcal{P}(p_0, \delta; d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$ in $\mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$ is compact, there exists a value of the parameter $\mathsf{q}_m \in \overline{\mathcal{P}(p_0, \delta; d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)}$ such that $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$ attains its minimum in $\overline{\mathcal{P}(p_0, \delta; d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)}$ at q_m. We show that $\mathsf{q}_m \in \mathcal{P}(p_0, \delta; d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$ and that it is a critical point for $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$ in $\mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$.

To see this, set $\mathsf{q}_0 = \left(\sqrt{\frac{\Gamma_1^+(p_0)}{F(p_0)}}\epsilon, [g_0], p_0\right) \in \mathcal{P}(p_0, \delta; d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$, where $[g_0] \in SO(3)$ is the maximum point of the function

$$SO(3) \ni [g] \mapsto \int_{B^4} \left((d\underline{A}_0)^-, g(dh_{p_0})^- g^{-1}\right) dx\,. \tag{5.5}$$

Making the identification $\operatorname{Im}\mathbb{H} \cong \mathbb{R}^3$, the function (5.5) can be rewritten as

$$SO(3) \ni R \mapsto \int_{B^4} \left((d\underline{A}_0)^-, R(dh_{p_0})^-\right) dx = \sum_{1\leq i,j\leq 3} R_{ij} \int_{B^4} \left((d\underline{A}_{0,i})^-, (dh_{p_0,j})^-\right) dx = \operatorname{tr}(RM(A_0, p_0))\,, \tag{5.6}$$

where $M(A_0, p)$ is the matrix defined in (2.2).
The results obtained in §3 for the case (1)-(a) yield

$$\int_{B^4} \left((d\underline{A}_{0,i})^-, g_0(dh_p)^- g_0^-\right) dx = \Gamma_1^+(p). \tag{5.7}$$

By Lemma 4.1 and by the asymptotic expansion in Proposition 3.1 in [4], one obtains

$$\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}_0) = C_\epsilon - 2\frac{\Gamma_1^+(p_0)^2}{F(p_0)}\epsilon^2 + r_5(\mathsf{q}) = C_\epsilon - 2G_1^+(p_0)\epsilon^2 + r_{5,\epsilon}, \quad \text{with } |r_{5,\epsilon}| \lesssim \epsilon^3\,, \tag{5.8}$$

where $C_\epsilon = 8\pi^2 + \epsilon^2 \int_{B^4} |F_{\underline{A}_\epsilon}{}^\epsilon|^2\, dx$ is a constant depending only on ϵ. On the other hand, writing $\mathsf{q}_m = (p_m, [g_m], \lambda_m)$, the results obtained in §3 for the case (1)-(a) yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}_m) &= C_\epsilon + 2\lambda_m^4 F(p_m) - 4\epsilon\lambda_m^2 \int_{B^4} \big((d\underline{A}_0)^-, g_m(dh_{p_m})^- g_m^{-1}\big)\, dx + r_{6,\epsilon} \\ &\geq C_\epsilon + 2\lambda_m^4 F(p_m) - 4\epsilon\lambda_m^2 \Gamma_1^+(p_m) + r_{6,\epsilon} \geq C_\epsilon - 2\epsilon^2 G_1^+(p_m) + r_{6,\epsilon}, \qquad \text{with } |r_{6,\epsilon}| \lesssim \epsilon^3\,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

where we have used the fact that the function $\lambda \mapsto 2\lambda^4 F(p_m) - 4\epsilon\lambda^2\Gamma_1^+(p_m)$ has minimum value $-2\epsilon^2 G_1^+(p_m)$.

Since $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}_0) \geq \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}_m)$, from (5.8), (5.9) we derive

$$G_1^+(p_m) \geq G_1^+(p_0) + \epsilon^{-2}(r_{6,\epsilon} - r_{5,\epsilon}). \tag{5.10}$$

Setting $\gamma := \min_{p \in \partial B_\delta(p_0)}(G_1^+(p_0) - G_1^+(p))$, by (5.10) we would have

$$0 < \gamma \leq \epsilon^{-2}(r_{5,\epsilon} - r_{6,\epsilon})$$

if $p_m \in \partial B_\delta(p_0)$. But this is a contradiction for small $\epsilon > 0$, since $|\epsilon^{-2}(r_{6,\epsilon} - r_{5,\epsilon})| \lesssim \epsilon$. Thus, $p_m \in B_\delta(p_0)$.

To prove $D_1\epsilon < \lambda_m < D_2\epsilon$, suppose first that $\lambda_m^2 = D_1\epsilon$. In this case, by (5.2), (5.8), one has, for small positive ϵ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}_m) &= C_\epsilon + 2\lambda_m^4 F(p_m) - 4\epsilon\lambda_m^2 \int_{B^4} \big((d\underline{A}_0)^-, g_m(dh_{p_m})^- g_m^{-1}\big)\, dx + r_{6,\epsilon} \\ &\geq C_\epsilon + 2\lambda_m^4 F(p_m) - 4\epsilon\lambda_m^2 \Gamma_1^+(p_m) + r_{6,\epsilon} \\ &\geq C_\epsilon + 2\epsilon^2(D_1^2 F(p_m) - 2D_1\Gamma_1^+(p_m)) + r_{6,\epsilon} \geq C_\epsilon - \epsilon^2 G_1^+(p_0) + r_{6,\epsilon} > \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}_0)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

This contradicts the minimality of q_m. Thus, we have $D_1\epsilon < \lambda_m^2$. A similar argument shows that $\lambda_m^2 < D_2\epsilon$, for small $\epsilon > 0$.

Summing up, for small $\epsilon > 0$, one has that $\mathsf{q}_m \in \mathcal{P}(p_0, \delta; d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$ and is a critical point of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$ in $\mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.2 in [4], $A_\epsilon := A(\mathsf{q}_m) + a(\mathsf{q}_m)$ is a solution to the Dirichlet problem $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$. Moreover, our construction yields $\epsilon^2 |F_{A_\epsilon}{}^\epsilon|^2\, dx \to 8\pi^2\delta_{p_0}$ in the sense of Radon measures, as $\epsilon \to 0$. This completes the proof of case (1) of Theorem 1.

Case (2). The proof of case (2) is quite similar to the one just given. The only difference is that the maximum value for the function (5.5) is $\Gamma_1^-(p) := \sqrt{\mu_1(A_0, p)} + \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0, p)} - \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0, p)}$ (cf. (2)-(a) in §3). $\square$

6 Proof of Theorem 2

In this section we prove the second of our existence theorems, i.e., the following

Theorem 2 *Let us define the functions* $G_2^\pm(p) := \frac{(\sqrt{\mu_1(p)} - \sqrt{\mu_2(p)} \mp \sqrt{\mu_3(p)})^2}{F(p)}$; $G_3^-(p) := \frac{(-\sqrt{\mu_1(p)} + \sqrt{\mu_2(p)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(p)})^2}{F(p)}$; $G_1^0(p) := \frac{(\sqrt{\mu_1(p)} + \sqrt{\mu_2(p)})^2}{F(p)}$; $G_2^0(p) := \frac{(\sqrt{\mu_1(p)} - \sqrt{\mu_2(p)})^2}{F(p)}$.
Assume that $p_0 \in B^4$ *satisfies one of the following conditions (1)-(a),(b), (2)-(a),(b),(c), (3)-(a),(b):*

(1) $\det M(A_0, p_0) > 0$ *and*

  (a) p_0 *is a non-degenerate critical point of* $G_1^+(p)$*, or*

  (b) $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} > \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$ *and* p_0 *is a non-degenerate critical point of* $G_2^+(p)$*;*

(2) $\det M(A_0, p_0) < 0$ *and*

  (a) $\mu_2(A_0,p_0) > \mu_3(A_0,p_0)$ *and* p_0 *is a non-degenerate critical point of* $G_1^-(p)$*, or*

  (b) $\mu_1(A_0,p_0) > \mu_2(A_0,p_0) > \mu_3(A_0,p_0)$ *and* p_0 *is a non-degenerate critical point of* $G_2^-(p)$*, or*

  (c) $\mu_1(A_0,p_0) > \mu_2(A_0,p_0)$*,* $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} < \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$ *and* p_0 *is a non-degenerate critical point of* $G_3^-(p)$*;*

(3) $\det M(A_0, p_0) = 0$ *and*

  (a) $\mu_2(a_0,p_0) > 0$ *and* p_0 *is a non-degenerate critical point of* $G_1^0(p)$*, or*

  (b) $\mu_1(A_0,p_0) > \mu_2(A_0,p_0) > 0$ *and* p_0 *is a non-degenerate critical point of* $G_2^0(p)$*.*

Then, there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ *and a family of connections* $\{A_\epsilon\}$ *indexed by* $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ *with the following properties:* A_ϵ *is a solution to* $\big(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon\big)$ *in* $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$*;* $\epsilon^2 |F_{A_\epsilon}{}^{\epsilon}|^2\, dx \to 8\pi^2 \delta_{p_0}$ *as* $\epsilon \to 0$ *in the sense of measures (i.e.* $\epsilon F_{A_\epsilon}{}^{\epsilon}$ *concentrates at* p_0 *as* $\epsilon \to 0$*).*

Proof: Since the different cases can all be proved by very similar arguments, we only show the proof for the case (1)-(b).
Case (1)-(b): Let $p_0 \in B^4$ satisfy the hypotheses in (1)-(b). By Lemma 4.2, $\langle \mathcal{J}_\epsilon'(\mathsf{q}), \mathsf{q}_1\rangle = \langle J_\epsilon'(\mathsf{q}), \mathsf{q}_1\rangle + r_{4,1}(\mathsf{q}) = a_{11}(\mathsf{q}) \frac{\partial J_\epsilon}{\partial p_1}(\mathsf{q}) + r_{4,1}(\mathsf{q})$. Since $a_{11}(\mathsf{q}) \simeq \epsilon^{3/2}$ (cf. Lemma 3.2 in [5]), $|r_{4,1}(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^4$, and $J_\epsilon'(\mathsf{q}) = \mathcal{F}_\epsilon'(\mathsf{q}) + r_2(\mathsf{q})$ (cf. Proposition 3.1 in [4]), the condition $\langle \mathcal{J}_\epsilon'(\mathsf{q}), \mathsf{q}_1\rangle = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial p_1}(\mathsf{q}) + r_{7,1}(\mathsf{q}) = 0, \qquad \text{with } |r_{7,1}(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^{5/2}\,. \tag{6.1}$$

More in general, by the same arguments, $\langle \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}), \mathsf{q}_i\rangle = 0$ for $i = 1, ..., 8$, or equivalently $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon'(\mathsf{q}) = 0$, is equivalent to the system

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial p_i}(\mathsf{q}) + r_{7,i}(\mathsf{q}) = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad |r_{7,i}(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^{5/2} \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le 4,\\
&\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \xi_i([g])}(\mathsf{q}) + r_{7,i+4}(\mathsf{q}) = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad |r_{7,i+4}(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^{5/2} \quad \text{for } 5 \le i \le 7,\\
&\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathsf{q}) + r_{7,8}(\mathsf{q}) = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad |r_{7,8}(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

We shall find a solution $\mathsf{q} = (p, [g], \lambda)$ to (6.2), which satisfies the following conditions:

(i) p is in some small neighborhood of p_0.

(ii) $[g] = \exp \xi [g_2^+(p)]$, $\xi \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ with small $|\xi|$, where $[g_2^+(p)] \in SO(3)$ is a critical point for the function

$$SO(3) \ni [g] \mapsto \int_{B^4} \big((d\underline{A}_0)^-, g(dh_p)^- g^{-1}\big)\, dx\ , \tag{6.3}$$

with critical value $\Gamma_2^+(A_0,p) := \sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p)} - \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p)} - \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p)}$ (cf. (1)-(b) in §3). (Note that, under our hypotheses, $\Gamma_2^+(A_0,p) > 0$ for all p near p_0).

(iii) $\lambda = \lambda_2^+(p)(1+\eta)$, where $|\eta|$ is small and $\lambda_2^+(p) = \left(\epsilon \frac{\Gamma_2^+(A_0,p)}{F(p)}\right)^{1/2}$.

(Note that, by (ii) and Lemma 2.1 (1), $\lambda_2^+(p)$ is well-defined if p is close to p_0).

We first rewrite the first equation in (6.2). Directly from the definitions above of $[g_2^+(p)]$ and $\lambda_2^+(p)$, it follows that

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(p, [g_2^+(p)], \lambda_2^+(p)) = -2\epsilon^2 G_2^+(p). \tag{6.4}$$

For p near p_0, in the case under consideration one has $\det M(A_0,p) > 0$, $\Gamma_2^+(A_0,p) > 0$ and $\mu_1(A_0,p) > \mu_2(A_0,p) > 0$. Thus, the critical point $[g_2^+(p)]$ is a non-degenerate critical point for the function (6.3) and, by the implicit function theorem, $p \mapsto [g_2^+(p)]$ is differentiable near p_0 (cf. §3 (1)-(b)). From (6.4), it follows

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial p_i}(p, [g_2^+(p)], \lambda_2^+(p)) = -2\epsilon^2 \frac{\partial G_2^+}{\partial p_i}(p). \tag{6.5}$$

For $\mathsf{q} = \mathsf{q}(p,\xi,\eta) := (p, \exp \xi [g_2^+(p)], \lambda_2^+(p)(1+\eta))$, the Taylor's formula yields

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial p_i}(\mathsf{q}(p,\xi,\eta)) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial p_i}(p, [g_2^+(p)], \lambda_2^+(p)) + r_{8,i}(p,\xi,\eta) \quad \text{with } |r_{8,i}(p,\xi,\eta)| \lesssim \epsilon^2(|\xi| + |\eta|). \tag{6.6}$$

By (6.5), (6.6), one can rewrite the first equation in (6.2) for $\mathsf{q} = \mathsf{q}(p,\xi,\eta)$ as

$$\frac{\partial G_2^+}{\partial p_i}(p) = r_{9,i}(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon) \quad \text{with } |r_{9,i}(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon)| \lesssim |\xi| + |\eta| + \epsilon^{1/2}. \tag{6.7}$$

Also, by Taylor's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial G_2^+}{\partial p_i}(p) &= \frac{\partial G_2^+}{\partial p_i}(p_0) + \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{\partial^2 G_2^+}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(p_0)(p_j - (p_0)_j) + r_{10,i}(p) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^4 \frac{\partial^2 G_2^+}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(p_0)(p_j - (p_0)_j) + r_{10,i}(p) \quad \text{with } |r_{10,i}(p)| \lesssim |p - p_0|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

By hypothesis, p_0 is a non-degenerate critical point for G_2^+, thus, by (6.7), (6.8), we may rewrite the first equation of the system (6.2) as

$$p - p_0 = \mathfrak{r}_1(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon) \quad \text{with } |\mathfrak{r}_1(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon)| \lesssim |p-p_0|^2 + |\xi| + |\eta| + \epsilon^{1/2}. \tag{6.9}$$

We next rewrite the second equation in (6.2).

We denote by $G(p,[g])$ the function (6.3). Since $\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \xi_i([g])}(p,[g],\lambda) = -4\epsilon\lambda^2 \frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi_i([g])}(p,[g])$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \xi_i([g])}(\mathfrak{q}(p,\xi,\eta)) = -4\epsilon\lambda_2^+(p)^2(1+\eta)^2 \frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi_i([g])}(p, \exp\xi[g_2^+(p)]) \\
&= \ -4\epsilon\lambda_2^+(p)^2(1+\eta)^2\left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi_i([g])}(p,[g_2^+(p)]) + \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial \xi_i([g])\partial \xi_j([g])}(p,[g_2^+(p)])\xi_j + r_{10,i+4}(p,\xi)\right) \\
&= \ -4\epsilon\lambda_2^+(p)^2(1+\eta)^2\left(\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial \xi_i([g])\partial \xi_j([g])}(p,[g_2^+(p)])\xi_j + r_{10,i}(p,\xi)\right) \quad \text{with } |r_{10,i}(p,\xi)| \lesssim |\xi|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

We now assume $|\eta| < 1/2$. Then, by the non-degeneracy of the critical point $[g_2^+(p)]$ and $\lambda_2^+(p) \simeq \epsilon^{1/2}$ for p near p_0, the second equation in (6.2) can be rewritten as

$$\xi = \mathfrak{r}_2(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon)\ , \quad \text{with} \quad |\mathfrak{r}_2(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon)| \lesssim |\xi|^2 + \epsilon^{1/2}. \tag{6.11}$$

Finally, we rewrite the third equation in (6.2).
By $\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(p,[g],\lambda) = 4\lambda^3 F(p) - 4\epsilon\lambda G(p,[g])$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathfrak{q}(p,\xi,\eta)) = 4\lambda_2^+(p)(1+\eta)^3F(p) - 4\epsilon\lambda_2^+(p)(1+\eta)G(p,\exp\xi[g_2^+(p)]) \\
&= 4\lambda_2^+(p)^3F(p) - 4\epsilon\lambda_2^+(p)G(p,[g_2^+(p)]) + 12\lambda_2^+(p)^3\eta F(p) - 4\epsilon\lambda_2^+(p)\eta G(p,[g_2^+(p)]) + r_{10,8}(p,\xi,\eta) \\
&= (12\lambda_2^+(p)^3F(p) - 4\epsilon\lambda_2^+(p)G(p,[g_2^+(p)]))\eta + r_{10,8}(p,\xi,\eta) \\
&= 8\lambda_2^+(p)\epsilon\Gamma_2^+(A_0,p)\eta + r_{10,8}(p,\xi,\eta) \quad \text{with } |r_{10,8}(p,\xi,\eta)| \lesssim \epsilon^{3/2}(|\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2).
\end{aligned}$$

From this, it follows that the last equation in (6.2) is equivalent to

$$\eta = \mathfrak{r}_3(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon) \quad \text{with } |\mathfrak{r}_3(p,\xi,\eta)| \lesssim |\xi|^2 + |\eta|^2 + \epsilon^{1/2}. \tag{6.12}$$

We now solve the system given by the equations (6.9), (6.11), (6.12) (equivalent to the system (6.2)), for small positive ϵ and within the set of parameters

$$M_\epsilon := \{(p,\xi,\eta) \in B^4 \times \mathfrak{so}(3) \times (-1/2,1/2) : |p-p_0| \le \epsilon^{1/8},\ |\xi| \le \epsilon^{1/4},\ |\eta| \le \epsilon^{1/4}\}.$$

To this purpose, for $(p,\xi,\eta) \in M_\epsilon$, $0 \le t \le 1$, we define the vector function

$$H_t(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon) := \begin{pmatrix} p-p_0 \\ \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} - t\begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{r}_1(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon) \\ \mathfrak{r}_2(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon) \\ \mathfrak{r}_3(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon) \end{pmatrix}.$$

For $p \in B^4$ with $|p-p_0| = \epsilon^{1/8}$, $\xi \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ with $|\xi| \le \epsilon^{1/4}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\eta| \le \epsilon^{1/4}$, from (6.9) it follows

$$|p-p_0| = \epsilon^{1/8} > |\mathfrak{r}_1(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon)|\,. \tag{6.13}$$

Similarly, for $\xi \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ with $|\xi| = \epsilon^{1/4}$, $p \in B^4$ with $|p-p_0| \le \epsilon^{1/8}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\eta| \le \epsilon^{1/4}$, from (6.11) it follows

$$|\xi| = \epsilon^{1/4} > |\mathfrak{r}_2(p,\xi,\eta;\epsilon)| \tag{6.14}$$

while, for $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\epsilon^{1/4} = |\eta|$, $p \in B^4$ with $|p - p_0| \leq \epsilon^{1/8}$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$ with $|\xi| \leq \epsilon^{1/4}$, the inequality (6.12) yields

$$|\eta| = \epsilon^{1/4} > |\mathfrak{r}_3(p, \xi, \eta; \epsilon)| \, . \tag{6.15}$$

Thus, from (6.13)–(6.15), it follows that $H_t(p, \xi, \eta; \epsilon) \neq 0$ for $(p, \xi, \eta) \in \partial M_\epsilon$ and $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Assume by contradiction that $H_1(p, \xi, \eta; \epsilon) \neq 0$ for all $(p, \xi, \eta) \in M_\epsilon$. Under this hypothesis, the function $\frac{H_1}{|H_1|} : M_\epsilon \cong B^8 \to S^7$ would be well-defined and continuous, hence homotopically trivial when restricted to ∂M_ϵ. On the other hand, the well-defined maps $\frac{H_t}{|H_t|} : \partial M_\epsilon \cong S^7 \to S^7$, for $0 \leq t \leq 1$, give a homotopy between $\frac{H_0}{|H_0|}$ and $\frac{H_1}{|H_1|}$. Since $\frac{H_0}{|H_0|} : \partial M_\epsilon \cong S^7 \to S^7$ is obviously homotopically non-trivial (in fact, its topological degree is 1), we have a contradiction. Thus, there exists $(p, \xi, \eta) \in M_\epsilon$ such that $H_1(p, \xi, \eta; \epsilon) = 0$, i.e., a solution of the system given by the equations (6.9), (6.11), (6.12). Since this solution satisfies $|p - p_0| \leq \epsilon^{1/8} \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, it concentrates at p_0 as $\epsilon \to 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2. $\square$

7 Proof of Theorem 3

The third and final existence theorem is the following.

Theorem 3 *Assume that there exists $p_0 \in B^4$ such that one of the following holds:*

(1) $\det M(A_0, p_0) > 0$, $\mu_1(A_0, p_0) > \mu_2(A_0, p_0) > \mu_3(A_0, p_0)$ *and* $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0, p_0)} > \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0, p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0, p_0)}$*;*

(2) $\det M(A_0, p_0) < 0$ *and* $\mu_1(A_0, p_0) > \mu_2(A_0, p_0) > \mu_3(A_0, p_0)$*;*

(3) $\det M(A_0, p_0) = 0$ *and* $\mu_1(A_0, p_0) > \mu_2(A_0, p_0) > 0$*;*

then, for all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, there exist at least two distinct solutions to $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ in $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$. Furthermore, the following alternative holds: there exists at least one non-minimizing solution, or there exist infinitely many minimizing solutions. In the hypotheses (2), if in addition $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0, p_0)} < \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0, p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0, p_0)}$, then there exist at least three distinct solutions, of which at least two non-minimizing, or there exist infinitely many minimizing solutions to $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ in $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$.

In order to prove Theorem 3 we need to prove Lemma 7.1, which enables us to apply the standard critical point theory (by showing that a subset of the parameter space, namely the set $\mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$ defined below, is invariant under the negative gradient flow of $\mathfrak{J}_\epsilon$), Lemma 7.2 and Corollary 7.1, where the topological properties of $\mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$ are studied.

To this purpose, let $C_\epsilon := 8\pi^2 + \int_{B^4} |F_{\underline{A}_\epsilon}{}^\epsilon|^2 \, dx$ be the constant in (5.8), and let us define

$$\mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2) = \{\mathsf{q} = (p, [g], \lambda) \in B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon}) : \mathfrak{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) \leq C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2\} \, . \tag{7.1}$$

Lemma 7.1 *Let C_0 be any given positive constant. There exist $0 < d_0 < 1$, $0 < D_1 < D_2$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that the following properties hold for all ϵ satisfying $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$:*

$$\Big\langle \frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_\epsilon}{\partial p}(\mathsf{q}), \frac{p}{|p|} \Big\rangle > 0, \ \textit{for } \mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2), \ p \in \partial B_{1-d_0}\,, \tag{7.2}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathsf{q}) < 0, \ \textit{for } \mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2), \ \lambda = \sqrt{D_1 \epsilon}\,, \tag{7.3}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathsf{q}) > 0, \ \textit{for } \mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2), \ \lambda = \sqrt{D_2 \epsilon}\,. \tag{7.4}$$

Proof: By Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 3.1 in [4],

$$C_\epsilon + \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) + r_1(\mathsf{q}) + r_3(\mathsf{q}) \le C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2,$$

for $\mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{P}(d_0, \lambda_0; D_1, D_2; \epsilon)$ with $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) \le C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2$.

Since $|r_1(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^3$ and $|r_3(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^3$, there exists $\epsilon(d_0, D_1, D_2) > 0$ (depending on d_0, D_1 and D_2) such that

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) \le -\frac{C_0}{2}\epsilon^2 \tag{7.5}$$

for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon(d_0, D_1, D_2)$ and $\mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$.
From (1) of Lemma 2.1, $-4\epsilon\lambda^2 G(p, [g]) < \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})$ and from (7.5) it follows that

$$G(p, [g]) \ge \frac{C_0}{8}\epsilon\lambda^{-2} \tag{7.6}$$

for $\mathsf{q} = (p, [g], \lambda) \in \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$, if $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon(d_0, D_1, D_2)$.

On the other hand, by (3) of Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, one has

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial p_i}(\mathsf{q}) = 2\lambda^4 \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_i}(p) - 4\epsilon\lambda^2 \frac{\partial G}{\partial p_i}(p, [g]) \ge C_2 D_1^2 \epsilon^2 \frac{1}{d_0^5}\frac{p_i}{|p|} - 4\epsilon^2 D_2 C_3$$

for $\mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$ with $p \in \partial B_{1-d_0}$ for some absolute constants $C_2, C_3 > 0$.
This inequality implies

$$\Big\langle \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial p}, \frac{p}{|p|} \Big\rangle \ge C_2 D_1^2 \epsilon^2 \frac{1}{d_0^5} - 4\epsilon^2 D_2 C_3. \tag{7.7}$$

From Proposition 3.1 in [4], Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 3.2 in [5] (cf. also the proof of Theorem 2 in the previous section), one obtains

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_\epsilon}{\partial p_i}(\mathsf{q}) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial p_i}(\mathsf{q}) + r_{11,i}(\mathsf{q}), \quad |r_{11,i}(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^{5/2} \quad (1 \le i \le 4) \tag{7.8}$$

and, combining (7.7), (7.8),

$$\Big\langle \frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_\epsilon}{\partial p}(\mathsf{q}), \frac{p}{|p|} \Big\rangle \ge C_2 D_1^2 \epsilon^2 \frac{1}{d_0^5} - 4\epsilon^2 D_2 C_3 + r_{12}(\mathsf{q}) \tag{7.9}$$

for $\mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$ with $p \in \partial B_{1-d_0}$, where $|r_{12}(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^{5/2}$.

We next estimate $\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathsf{q}) = 8\lambda^3 F(p) - 8\epsilon\lambda G(p, [g])$.

From (7.6), one obtains

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathsf{q}) = 8\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}(D_1\epsilon F(p) - \epsilon G(p,[g])) \le 8\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}\Big(D_1\epsilon F(p) - \frac{C_0}{8D_1}\epsilon\Big), \tag{7.10}$$

for $\mathsf{q} \in \mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$, $\lambda = \sqrt{D_1\epsilon}$.
Similarly, by Lemma 2.2,

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathsf{q}) \ge 8\sqrt{D_2\epsilon}(D_2\epsilon F(p) - C_4\epsilon) \tag{7.11}$$

for $\mathsf{q} \in \mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$, $\lambda = \sqrt{D_2\epsilon}$, for some absolute constant $C_4 > 0$.

We now observe that, by (1), (2) of Lemma 2.1, there exists an absolute constant $C_5 > 0$ such that $F(p) \ge C_5$ for all $p \in B^4$. To complete the proof, we choose $D_2 > 0$ such that $D_2C_5 - C_4 > \frac{C_4}{2}$ (take for example $D_2 = \frac{2C_4}{C_5}$ - notice that this is independent of d_0), and $D_1 = Dd_0^2$, where the absolute constant $D > 0$ is chosen to satisfy

$$Dd_0^2F(p) - \frac{C_0}{8Dd_0^2} < -\frac{C_0}{16Dd_0^2} \quad \text{for all } p \in B_{1-d_0}, \tag{7.12}$$

i.e., $D^2d_0^4F(p) < \frac{C_0}{16}$ holds for all $p \in B_{1-d_0}$. (By (2) of Lemma 2.1, one can easily see that such constant D exists).
Furthermore, we choose $0 < d_0 < 1$ so that

$$C_2D^2\frac{1}{d_0} - 4D_2C_3 \ge 2. \tag{7.13}$$

By (7.9), there exists $0 < \epsilon_0 < \epsilon(d_0, D_1, D_2)$ such that for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $\mathsf{q} \in \mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$, $p \in \partial B_{1-d_0}$, one has

$$\Big\langle \frac{\partial \mathfrak{J}_\epsilon}{\partial p}, \frac{p}{|p|} \Big\rangle \ge 2\epsilon^2 + r_{12}(\mathsf{q}) > 0. \tag{7.14}$$

From (7.10), (7.12), Proposition 3.1 in [4], and Lemma 4.2 (cf. also the proof of Theorem 2), we also have

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{J}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathsf{q}) = \frac{\partial \mathfrak{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathsf{q}) + r_{13}(\mathsf{q}) \le -\frac{C_0}{2\sqrt{D_1}d_0}\epsilon^{3/2} + r_{13}(\mathsf{q}) < 0, \qquad (\text{with } |r_{13}(\mathsf{q})| \lesssim \epsilon^2), \tag{7.15}$$

for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $\mathsf{q} \in \mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$, with $\lambda = \sqrt{D_1\epsilon}$, if $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is chosen suitably small.
Similarly, by (7.11),

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{J}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathsf{q}) = \frac{\partial \mathfrak{F}_\epsilon}{\partial \lambda}(\mathsf{q}) + r_{13}(\mathsf{q}) \ge 4\sqrt{D}_2C_4\epsilon^{3/2} + r_{13}(\mathsf{q}) > 0, \text{ with } \lambda = \sqrt{D_2\epsilon} \tag{7.16}$$

for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $\mathsf{q} \in \mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$, if $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is chosen suitably small. The proof now follows from (7.14) – (7.16). □

As a consequence of Lemma 7.1, the set $\mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$ is invariant under the negative gradient flow of $\mathfrak{J}_\epsilon$, i.e., the solution of the differential equation $\frac{d\mathsf{q}(t)}{dt} = -\mathfrak{J}_\epsilon'(\mathsf{q}(t))$ stays in $\mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$ for all $t \ge 0$. Therefore, one can apply the standard critical point theory (see [1], [8], [9]) to the function $\mathfrak{J}_\epsilon$ restricted on $\mathfrak{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$.

The number of critical points of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$ on $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$ depends on the topological complexity of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0, D_1, D_2)$. To study the topological properties of this set, we consider the function $G(p,[g]) = \int_{B^4}\big(F^-_{\underline{A}_0}, g(dh_p)^- g^{-1}\big)$, and for $p_0 \in B^4$, $\eta > 0$, we take the following subset of $SO(3)$:

$$\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta) = \{[g] \in SO(3) : -G(p_0,[g]) \leq -\eta\}\ . \tag{7.17}$$

We recall the following topological notion (see [1], [8], [9] for more details): let X be a topological space. The Ljusternik-Schnirelman category (LS-category in short) of a closed subset $A \subset X$ with respect to X, denoted by $\mathrm{cat}(A,X)$, is defined as the least integer k such that $A \subset A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_k$, where the A_i's (for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$) are closed and contractible in X.
We have the following:

Lemma 7.2 *Assume that there exists* $p_0 \in B^4$ *such that* $\mu_1(A_0,p_0) > \mu_2(A_0,p_0) > \mu_3(A_0,p_0)$. *Then there exists* $\eta > 0$ *such that the following holds:*

(1) If p_0 *satisfies* $\det M(A_0,p_0) \geq 0$ *and* $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} > \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$*, then* *cat*$(\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta), SO(3)) \geq 2$.

(2) If p_0 *satisfies* $\det M(A_0,p_0) < 0$*, then cat*$(\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta), SO(3)) \geq 2$. *If in addition* p_0 *satisfies* $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} < \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$*, then cat*$(\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta), SO(3)) \geq 3$.

Proof: The proof follows from Morse theory (cf. [7]). If $\mu_1(A_0,p_0) > \mu_2(A_0,p_0) > \mu_3(A_0,p_0)$, the function $G(p_0,\cdot)$ on $SO(3)$ is a Morse function with four critical points, with Morse indexes equal to 3, 2, 1, and 0 (cf. §3). By Morse theory, this yields a cell decomposition of $SO(3)$ as follows

$$SO(3) \cong e^0 \cup e^1 \cup e^2 \cup e^3, \tag{7.18}$$

where e^i $(i = 0,1,2,3)$ is a cell of dimension i. We examine the two cases separately.

(1) $\det M(A_0,p_0) \geq 0$, $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} > \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$.
In this case, two of the critical points of the function $G(p_0,\cdot)$ on $SO(3)$ assume positive critical values, namely $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$ and $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} - \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} - \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$, with Morse indexes 3 and 2, respectively (cf. (1) of §3). Set $\eta = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} - \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} - \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)})$. By Morse theory, $\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta)$ is homotopically equivalent to $e^0 \cup e^1$, we write $\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta) \cong e^0 \cup e^1$. (This is meant with respect to the cell decomposition 'dual' to (7.18)). Since $H_1(SO(3);\mathbb{Z}_2) \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2$ is generated by the cell e^1, $\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta) \subset SO(3)$ is not contractible. This yields $\mathrm{cat}(\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta), SO(3)) \geq 2$.

(2) $\det M(A_0,p_0) < 0$.
In this case, at least two of the critical points of the function $G(p_0,\cdot)$ on $SO(3)$ assume positive critical values, namely $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} - \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$ and $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} - \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$. Setting $\eta = \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$, one can show by the same argument as in the previous case, that the set $\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta)$ is not contractible in $SO(3)$ and $\mathrm{cat}(\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta), SO(3)) \geq 2$. In the additional hypothesis $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} < \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$, three of the critical points of $G(p_0,\cdot)$ on $SO(3)$ assume positive critical values, namely $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} -$

$\sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$, $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} - \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$ and $-\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$. Set $\eta = \frac{1}{2}(-\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)})$. By Morse theory, $\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta) \simeq e^0 \cup e^1 \cup e^2$ (homotopically equivalent with respect to the cell decomposition dual to (7.18)). By contradiction, assume $\mathrm{cat}(\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta), SO(3)) \leq 2$. By Morse theory, $SO(3)$ is obtained by attaching the 3-cell e^3, in correspondence with the maximum of $-G(p_0,\cdot)$ and which is contractible in $SO(3)$, to $\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta)$. Thus, one would also have $\mathrm{cat}(SO(3), SO(3)) \leq 3$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{cat}(SO(3), SO(3)) \geq \mathrm{cuplength}\, H^*(SO(3);\mathbb{Z}_2) + 1 = 4$, where $\mathrm{cuplength}\, H^*(SO(3);\mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the cuplength of the cohomology ring $H^*(SO(3);\mathbb{Z}_2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2[a]/(a^4)$, where $\deg a = 1$ (cf. [1], [8]). This yields a contradiction. Thus, $\mathrm{cat}(\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta), SO(3)) \geq 3$.

This completes the proof. $\square$

Associated with the set $\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta)$, we define the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta) := \{p_0\} \times \mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta) \times \{\lambda_0\} \subset B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon}) \,, \tag{7.19}$$

where $\lambda_0 := \left(\frac{\eta\epsilon}{F(p_0)}\right)^{1/2}$.

The following is a corollary of Lemma 7.2.

Corollary 7.1 *In the hypotheses of Lemma 7.2, the following assertions hold for the cases (1) and (2), respectively:*

(1) cat$(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta), B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})) \geq 2$.

(2) cat$(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta), B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})) \geq 2$. *Moreover, if* p_0 *satisfies the additional hypothesis* $\sqrt{\mu_1(A_0,p_0)} < \sqrt{\mu_2(A_0,p_0)} + \sqrt{\mu_3(A_0,p_0)}$, *then*

$$\mathit{cat}(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta), B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})) \geq 3.$$

Proof: (1) Assume, by contradiction, that $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta)$ be contractible in $B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})$. Then there exists $h : [0,1] \times \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta) \to B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})$ such that $h(0,\cdot) = \tilde{\iota}$, where $\tilde{\iota}$ is the inclusion $\tilde{\iota} : \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta) \hookrightarrow B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})$, and $h(1,\cdot) := \mathrm{const}$. We define the map H as the following composition of maps

$$H : [0,1] \times \mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta) \hookrightarrow [0,1] \times \tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta) \xrightarrow{h} B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{pr}_2} SO(3),$$

where the first inclusion is given by $(t,[g]) \mapsto (t,(p_0,[g],\lambda_0))$ and pr_2 is the projection on the second factor. The map H satisfies $H(0,\cdot) = \iota$, where $\iota : \mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta) \hookrightarrow SO(3)$, and $H(1,\cdot) := \mathrm{const}$, yielding a contradiction since $\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta)$ is not contractible in $SO(3)$.

(2) The first part of the statement is proved as in (1). We need to prove the second part. By contradiction, assume that, in the given additional hypothesis, $\mathrm{cat}(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta), B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})) = 2$. Then there exist contractible closed sets $\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2 \subset B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta) \subset \tilde{A}_1 \cup \tilde{A}_2$. Let us take the projection $\mathrm{pr}_{1,3} : B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon}) \to B_{1-d_0} \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})$, and define $A_1 := \mathrm{pr}_{1,3}^{-1}(\{(p_0,\lambda_0)\}) \cap \tilde{A}_1$ and $A_2 :=$

$\mathrm{pr}_{1,3}^{-1}(\{(p_0,\lambda_0)\})\cap\tilde{A}_2$. Under the natural identification $SO(3)\cong\{p_0\}\times SO(3)\times\{\lambda_0\}$, A_1 and A_2 are closed subsets of $SO(3)$ and $\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta)\subset A_1\cup A_2$. Moreover, the composition of maps

$$[0,1]\times A_1\hookrightarrow[0,1]\times\tilde{A}_1\xrightarrow{h_1}B_{1-d_0}\times SO(3)\times(\sqrt{D_1\epsilon},\sqrt{D_2\epsilon})\xrightarrow{\mathrm{pr}_2}SO(3),$$

with $h_1:[0,1]\times\tilde{A}_1\to B_{1-d_0}\times SO(3)\times(\sqrt{D_1\epsilon},\sqrt{D_2\epsilon})$ satisfying $h_1(0,\cdot)=\tilde{\iota}_1$ (where $\tilde{\iota}_1:\tilde{A}_1\hookrightarrow B_{1-d_0}\times SO(3)\times(\sqrt{D_1\epsilon},\sqrt{D_2\epsilon})$ is the inclusion), and $h_1(1,\cdot):=$ const, shows that A_1 is contractible in $SO(3)$. Similarly, A_2 is contractible in $SO(3)$. This yields $\mathrm{cat}(\mathcal{S}(p_0,\eta),SO(3))\leq 2$, thus a contradiction. This completes the proof. $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3: Let $\eta>0$ be as in Lemma 7.2. We first show that for $C_0=\frac{\eta^2}{F(p_0)}$ and for all small $\epsilon>0$,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta)\subset\mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon-C_0\epsilon^2}(d_0,D_1,D_2). \tag{7.20}$$

In fact, for $(p_0,[g],\lambda_0)\in\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta)$,

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(p_0,[g],\lambda_0)=2\lambda_0^4F(p_0)-4\epsilon\lambda_0^2G(p_0,[g])\leq 2\lambda_0^4F(p_0)-4\epsilon\lambda_0^2\eta\leq-2\frac{\eta^2}{F(p_0)}\epsilon^2.$$

From Proposition 3.1 in [4] and Lemma 4.1 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(p_0,[g],\lambda_0)&=C_\epsilon+2\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(p_0,[g],\lambda_0)+r_1(p_0,[g],\lambda_0)+r_3(p_0,[g],\lambda_0)\\&\leq C_\epsilon-2\frac{\eta^2}{F(p_0)}\epsilon^2+r_1(p_0,[g],\lambda_0)+r_3(p_0,[g],\lambda_0)\leq C_\epsilon-\frac{\eta^2}{F(p_0)}\epsilon^2\end{aligned} \tag{7.21}$$

if $\epsilon>0$ is small enough.

By Corollary 7.1, we see that in all the different cases in Theorem 3, the set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}_2:=\{&\text{compact sets } A\subset B_{1-d_0}\times SO(3)\times(\sqrt{D_1\epsilon},\sqrt{D_2\epsilon}):\\&\mathrm{cat}(A,B_{1-d_0}\times SO(3)\times(\sqrt{D_1\epsilon},\sqrt{D_2\epsilon})\geq 2\}\end{aligned}$$

is non-empty (in fact, $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}(p_0,\eta)\in\mathcal{K}_2$).

Let

$$c_2:=\inf_{A\in\mathcal{K}_2}\{\max\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}):\mathsf{q}\in A\}.$$

Then by (7.20),

$$c_2\leq C_\epsilon-C_0\epsilon^2. \tag{7.22}$$

Combining (7.22) with Lemma 7.1, standard arguments show that c_2 is a critical value for $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$. By contradiction, assume not. Then, by flowing along the negative gradient of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$, one sees that there exists a δ, $0<\delta<C_0\epsilon^2$, and a deformation Θ of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon-C_0\epsilon^2}$ (i.e., $\Theta=\theta(1,\cdot)$, for some continuous $\theta:[0,1]\times\mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon-C_0\epsilon^2}\to\mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{C_\epsilon-C_0\epsilon^2}$ with $\theta(0,\cdot)=\mathrm{Id}$) which satisfies

$$\Theta(\mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{c_2+\delta})\subset\mathcal{J}_\epsilon^{c_2-\delta}. \tag{7.23}$$

Take $A\in\mathcal{K}_2$ such that $\max_{\mathsf{q}\in A}\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})<c_2+\delta$. Since $\Theta(A)\in\mathcal{K}_2$ (cf. [9]) and $\max_{\mathsf{q}\in\Theta(A)}\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q})\leq c_2-\delta$ by (7.23), this contradicts the definition of c_2. Thus c_2 is a critical value of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$.

Furthermore, by Lemma 7.1,

$$c_1 := \min\{\mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) : \mathsf{q} \in B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})\}$$

is also a critical value of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$.

If $c_1 < c_2$, there are at least two critical points of $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$ on $B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon})$, and at least one of them is a non-minimal critical point. If instead $c_1 = c_2$, then the LS-category of the critical set

$$\mathcal{C}(c_1) := \{q \in B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon}) : \mathcal{J}'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) = 0,\ \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) = c_1\}$$

is at least 2 (see [9]), hence, $\#\mathcal{C}(c_1) = +\infty$. If, furthermore, $c_1 = \inf_{A\in\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)} \epsilon^2\mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A)$, there are infinitely many minimizing solutions in $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$. Otherwise, i.e., if $c_1 > \inf_{A\in\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)} \epsilon^2\mathcal{YM}_\epsilon(A)$, there are infinitely many non-minimal critical points. This complete the proof, except for the second statement in (2).

To prove the latter, we consider the set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}_3 := \{&\text{compact sets } A \subset B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon}) : \\ &\qquad \text{cat}(A, B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon}) \geq 3\},\end{aligned}$$

which again is non-empty by Corollary 7.1, and define

$$c_3 := \inf_{A\in\mathcal{K}_3}\{\max \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) : \mathsf{q} \in A\} \leq C_\epsilon - C_0\epsilon^2\ ,$$

which is a critical value for $\mathcal{J}_\epsilon$. We may assume $c_1 < c_2$ (if $c_1 = c_2$, we have already showed that there are infinitely many solutions). If also $c_2 < c_3$, then there are at least two non-minimizing solutions. If $c_2 = c_3$, again, the LS-category of $\mathcal{C}(c_2) = \{\mathsf{q} \in B_{1-d_0} \times SO(3) \times (\sqrt{D_1\epsilon}, \sqrt{D_2\epsilon}) : \mathcal{J}'_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) = 0,\ \mathcal{J}_\epsilon(\mathsf{q}) = c_2\}$ is at least 2, hence $\#\mathcal{C}(c_2) = +\infty$. Thus, there are infinitely many non-minimizing solutions. So, the assertion (2) of Theorem 3 is completely proved for all the different cases. □

The proof above yields the following corollary:

Corollary 7.2 *Assume there exists a* $p_0 \in B^4$ *and* $\eta > 0$ *such that* $\mathcal{S}(p_0, \eta)$ *is not contractible in* $SO(3)$. *Then there exist at least two solutions of* $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ *in* $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$. *Furthermore, if one assumes that cat*$(\mathcal{S}(p_0, \eta), SO(3)) \geq 3$, *then there exist at least three solutions of* $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ *in* $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(A_0)$.

8 Examples

In this section we perform two tasks. First we illustrate a method to construct boundary data that yield any prescribed matrix M (precisely, for any given matrix M, a boundary value is constructed such that $M(A_0, p_0) = M$), thus showing that the different cases in Theorem 3 can all be achieved (Proposition 8.1) . Second, We show that the non-degeneracy condition $\mu_1(A_0, p_0) > \mu_2(A_0, p_0) > \mu_3(A_0, p_0)$ (where the $\mu_i(A_0, p_0)$'s $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ are the eigenvalues of

$M(A_0,p_0)^t M(A_0,p_0))$ can always be obtained by making an an arbitrarily small perturbation of the boundary value A_0 (Proposition 8.2). This can be done while leaving the other conditions in Theorems 1-3 unaffected.

Let $A_0 \in C^\infty(T^*\partial B^4 \otimes \mathfrak{so}(3))$ be a given boundary value and let $\underline{A}_0 \in C^\infty(T^*B^4 \otimes \mathfrak{so}(3))$ be any solution to $(\mathcal{D}_0)$ with boundary value A_0 (recall that $d\underline{A}_0$ is uniquely determined by the boundary data A_0).

Let $\omega_1^- := dx^1 \wedge dx^2 - dx^3 \wedge dx^4$, $\omega_2^- := dx^1 \wedge dx^3 + dx^2 \wedge dx^4$, $\omega_3^- := dx^1 \wedge dx^4 - dx^2 \wedge dx^3$ be the basis for anti-self dual 2-forms on $\mathbb{R}^4$ introduced in §1.2. We observe that $\omega_1^- = d\beta_1^-$, $\omega_2^- = d\beta_2^-$ and $\omega_3^- = d\beta_3^-$, with $\beta_1^- = x^1 dx^2 - x^3 dx^4$, $\beta_2^- = x^1 dx^3 + x^2 dx^4$, $\beta_3^- = x^1 dx^4 - x^2 dx^3$.

Let us define a family of connections on B^4 parameterized by real 3×3 matrices $\mathsf{A} := (a_{ij})$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{B}_0(\mathsf{A}) &:= \underline{B}_{0,1}(\mathsf{A})i + \underline{B}_{0,2}(\mathsf{A})j + \underline{B}_{0,3}(\mathsf{A})k \in C^\infty(T^*B^4 \otimes \mathfrak{so}(3)), \\ \text{with } \underline{B}_{0,l}(\mathsf{A}) &:= \underline{A}_{0,l} + a_{1l}\beta_1^- + a_{2l}\beta_2^- + a_{3l}\beta_3^-, \quad 1 \le l \le 3, \end{aligned} \tag{8.1}$$

and a family of boundary connections $B_0(\mathsf{A}) = \iota^* \underline{B}_0(\mathsf{A})$. (Here, following the notation introduced in [4], $\underline{A}_0 := \underline{A}_{0,1}i + \underline{A}_{0,2}j + \underline{A}_{0,3}k$).

Note that, for any choice of the matrix A, the connection $\underline{B}_0(\mathsf{A})$ is a solution to $(\mathcal{D}_0)$ with boundary value $B_0(\mathsf{A})$. The corresponding matrix $M(B_0(\mathsf{A}),p) := (m_{ij}(B_0(\mathsf{A}),p))_{1\le i,j\le 3}$ is computed explicitly as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{ij}(B_0(\mathsf{A}),p) &:= \int_{B^4} \big((d\underline{B}_{0,j}(\mathsf{A}))^-, (dh_{p,i})^-\big) \\ &= m_{ij}(A_0,p) + a_{1j}\int_{B^4}\big(\omega_1^-, (dh_{p,i})^-\big) + a_{2j}\int_{B^4}\big(\omega_2^-, (dh_{p,i})^-\big) + a_{3j}\int_{B^4}\big(\omega_3^-, (dh_{p,i})^-\big). \end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

Here, we recall that $h_p := h_{p,1}i + h_{p,2}j + h_{p,3}k$, where the components $h_{p,l}$ $(l = 1,2,3)$ are harmonic, and $(dh_{p,l})^- := (dh_{p,l})_1^-\omega_1^- + (dh_{p,l})_2^-\omega_2^- + (dh_{p,l})_3^-\omega_3^-$. In this notation, $(\omega_k^-, (dh_{p,l})^-) = 2(dh_{p,l})_k^-$. Since the components $(dh_{p,l})_k^-$ are also harmonic on B^4, by the mean value property for harmonic functions, one has

$$\int_{B^4}\big(\omega_k^-, (dh_{p,l})^-\big) = 2\int_{B^4}(dh_{p,l})_k^- = 2|B^4|(dh_{p,l})_k^-(0) = \pi^2 (dh_{p,l})_k^-(0), \tag{8.3}$$

where $|B^4| = \frac{\pi^2}{2}$ is the Lebesgue measure of B^4.
Combining (8.2), (8.3), one obtains

$$M(B_0(\mathsf{A}),p) = M(A_0,p) + \pi^2 H(p)\mathsf{A}, \quad \text{with } H(p) := ((dh_{p,l})_k^-(0))_{1\le l,k\le 3}\,. \tag{8.4}$$

From (2.5) – (2.7), $H(p)$ can be written as $H(p) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{h}_0(p) & \mathsf{h}_1(p) & \mathsf{h}_2(p) \\ -\mathsf{h}_1(p) & \mathsf{h}_0(p) & \mathsf{h}_3(p) \\ -\mathsf{h}_2(p) & -\mathsf{h}_3(p) & \mathsf{h}_0(p) \end{pmatrix}$, with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{h}_0(p) &= \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial \alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^1} + \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^3} + \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^4}\Big)(0), \\
\mathsf{h}_1(p) &= \frac{1}{2}\Big(- \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^4} + \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^1}\Big)(0), \\
\mathsf{h}_2(p) &= \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\partial \alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^3} + \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^4} - \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^1} - \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^2}\Big)(0), \\
\mathsf{h}_3(p) &= \frac{1}{2}\Big(- \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,1}}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,2}}{\partial x^1} + \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,3}}{\partial x^4} - \frac{\partial \alpha_{p,4}}{\partial x^3}\Big)(0).
\end{aligned}$$

One has $\det H(p) = \mathsf{h}_0(p)(\mathsf{h}_0(p)^2 + \mathsf{h}_1(p)^2 + \mathsf{h}_2(p)^2 + \mathsf{h}_3(p)^2)$ and also, by (2.8), $\mathsf{h}_0(p) > 0$ for all $p \in B^4$. Thus, $H(p)$ is non-singular for all $p \in B^4$.
This, in particular, implies the following result:

Proposition 8.1 *For any given $p_0 \in B^4$, and any given 3×3 matrix M, there exists always a 3×3 matrix A such that $M(B_0(\mathsf{A}), p_0) = M$. Thus, the different hypotheses of Theorem 3 can be obtained by choosing a suitable real matrix A (and corresponding boundary data $B_0(\mathsf{A})$).*

Proposition 8.1, combined with Theorem 3, yields many examples of boundary values of the form $B_0(\mathsf{A})$ such that $(\mathfrak{D}_\epsilon)$ has multiple solutions in $\mathcal{A}_{+1}(B_0(\mathsf{A}))$, as well as non-minimizing solutions. Notice that, by elliptic regularity, the conditions in Theorems 1–3 are open conditions with respect to the boundary value (for example, with respect to $H^{1/2}$-topology). The following proposition holds.

Proposition 8.2 *For any given boundary connection $A_0 \in C^\infty(T^*\partial B^4 \otimes \mathfrak{so}(3))$ and any given $p_0 \in B^4$, there exists an arbitrarily small perturbation $\tilde{A}_0 \in C^\infty(T^*\partial B^4 \otimes \mathfrak{so}(3))$ of A_0 such that the eigenvalues of $M(\tilde{A}_0, p_0)^t M(\tilde{A}_0, p_0)$ satisfy $\mu_1(\tilde{A}_0, p_0) > \mu_2(\tilde{A}_0, p_0) > \mu_3(\tilde{A}_0, p_0) > 0$.*

Proof: We seek a boundary connection $\tilde{A}_0$ of the form $B_0(\mathsf{A})$ for some matrix A (as constructed in the proof of Proposition 8.1), with the desired requirements.

To this purpose, we first seek a 3×3 matrix X such that the eigenvalues of $M(A_0, p_0) + X$ satisfy the requirements. We then choose A such that $\pi^2 H(p_0)\mathsf{A} = X$. For $\tilde{A}_0 = B_0(\mathsf{A})$, the statement would then follow from (8.4).

Let us choose a matrix $Q \in SO(3)$ such that

$$Q^{-1} M(A_0, p_0)^t M(A_0, p_0) Q = \mathrm{diag}(\mu_1(A_0, p_0), \mu_2(A_0, p_0), \mu_3(A_0, p_0)).$$

By taking an arbitrarily small perturbation, we may assume that $M(A_0, p_0)$ is non-singular. For small $\mu > 0$, we choose X such that $Q^{-1} M(A_0, p_0)^t X Q = \mathrm{diag}(3\mu, 2\mu, \mu)$ (take $X = (M(A_0, p_0)^t)^{-1} Q \,\mathrm{diag}\,(3\mu, 2\mu, \mu)\, Q^{-1}$). We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
& Q^{-1}(M(A_0, p_0) + X)^t (M(A_0, p_0) + X) Q \\
&= Q^{-1} M(A_0, p_0)^t M(A_0, p_0) Q + Q^{-1} M(A_0, p_0)^t X Q + Q^{-1} X^t M(A_0, p_0) Q + Q^{-1} X^t X Q \\
&= \mathrm{diag}\,(\mu_1(A_0, p_0), \mu_2(A_0, p_0), \mu_3(A_0, p_0)) + \mathrm{diag}\,(6\mu, 4\mu, 2\mu) + O(\mu^2). \qquad (8.5)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by taking A such that $\pi^2 H(p_0)\mathsf{A} = X$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1(B_0(\mathsf{A}), p_0) &= \mu_1(A_0, p_0) + 6\mu + O(\mu^2),\\ \mu_2(B_0(\mathsf{A}), p_0) &= \mu_2(A_0, p_0) + 4\mu + O(\mu^2),\\ \mu_3(B_0(\mathsf{A}), p_0) &= \mu_3(A_0, p_0) + 2\mu + O(\mu^2).\end{aligned}$$

These imply that there exists $\bar{\mu} > 0$ such that, for all $0 < \mu < \bar{\mu}$, one has

$$\mu_1(B_0(\mathsf{A}), p_0) > \mu_2(B_0(\mathsf{A}), p_0) > \mu_3(B_0(\mathsf{A}), p_0) > 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

Conjecture 8.1 *One could look for multiple solutions also in the components $\mathcal{A}_k(A_0)$, for $k \neq \pm 1$. We conjecture that multiple solutions to $(\mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ exist in each component $\mathcal{A}_k(A_0)$, for small $\epsilon > 0$, for a rather general family of boundary values. For example, one may seek multiple solutions in $\mathcal{A}_0(A_0)$ of the form $A = \underline{A}_\epsilon \# \frac{1}{\epsilon}(1\text{-instanton}) \# \frac{1}{\epsilon}(-1\text{-instanton})$. This would require proofs similar to the ones established in this paper, but with lengthier and more delicate calculations.*

References

[1] K. C. Chang: *Infinite dimensional Morse theory and multiple solution problems.* Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications **6**, Birkhäuser, Boston (1993).

[2] D. Gilberg, N. Trudinger: *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order.* 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag, New York (1983).

[3] T. Isobe, A. Marini: *On topologically distinct solutions of the Dirichlet problem for Yang-Mills connections.* Car. Var. **5** (1997), 345–358.

[4] T. Isobe, A. Marini: *Small coupling limit and multiple solutions to the Dirichlet Problem for Yang-Mills connections in 4 dimensions - Part I.*

[5] T. Isobe, A. Marini: *Small coupling limit and multiple solutions to the Dirichlet Problem for Yang-Mills connections in 4 dimensions - Part III.*

[6] A. Marini: *Dirichlet and Neumann boundary problems for Yang-Mills connections.* Comm. Pure and Appl. Math. **45** (1992), 1015–1050.

[7] J. Milnor: *Morse Theory.* Annals of Mathematical Studies **51**, Princeton University Press, Princeton (1963).

[8] J. T. Schwartz: *Nonlinear functional Analysis.* Gordon & Breach, New York (1969).

[9] M. Struwe: *Variational Methods. Applications to nonlinear partial differential equations and Hamiltonian systems,* 4th edn. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York (2008).

[10] C. H. Taubes: *Path-connected Yang-Mills moduli spaces.* J. Differ. Geom. 19, 337-392 (1984).

[11] M. E. Taylor: *Partial Differential Equations. Basic Theory.* Texts in Applied Math. **23**, Springer.